THE

JOURNAL

OF

ORIENTAL RESEARCH

MADRAS

(Founded by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M.A.)

INDEX

(Prepared by Sri. K. Venkateswara Sarma,
University Oriental Mss. Library, Trivandrum)

Vol. XV **1945-'46**

त म सो मा ज्यो ति र्ग म य

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MYLAPORE

MADRAS

CONTENTS

PAGES

Foreword: The Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., C. H. .. Pt. I. i-ii
Ourselves .. „ iii-iv
Gleanings from the Prakaṭārtha: Prof. M. Hiriyanna ... 1-8
Did Dhruva Abdicate: Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri ... 9-12
The Payyūr Bhaṭṭas: Dr. C. Kunhan Raja .. 13-17
The Semantic History of the words Nāsatyāu and Dasrāu: Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri ... 18-20
On the Affinity between a Terracotta Figurine of the Indus Valley Age and a Stone-Sculpture of the Maurya Age and its Significance: Charu Chandra Das Gupta ... 21-24
Author of the Anunyāsa: K. Madhava Krishna Sarma .. 25-27
The Concept of Keynote in the Taittirīya Prātiśākhya: C. R. Sankaran .. 28-33
Date of the Prāyaścitta-candrikā of Viśvanāthabhaṭṭa, son of Narasiṁha Dīkṣita—Before A.D. 1543: P.K. Gode. 34-36
Our First President (The late Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri): K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar .. Pt. II. i-ii
The Doctrine of Niyoga: Prof. M. Hiriyanna ... 37-47
Vedic Studies, III: The Root Śvas, Śuṣ: Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah .. 48-63
On the Authorship of the Śatakatrayī: D. D. Kosambi ... 64-77
Indu, the Author of the Anunyāsa: Dr. V. Raghavan ... 78
History of Medicine in India—A Few Questions: Dr. D. V. S. Reddy ... 79-82
Book Reviews Pt. II end, 158, 187-97
Obituary Notices Pt. II end, 158-61, 200-01
The Late Sir P. S. Sivaswami Iyer: K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar .. Pt. III. i-ii
The Quest of Sītā—A Critical Study of Vālmīki's Technique: R. Narayana Aiyar ... 83-109
On a Meaning of the word Kauśika: Dr. V. Raghavan ... 110-116
Nandivarman II Pallavamalla: Date of Accession Reconsidered: Dr. N. Venkataramanayya ... 117-126
Some Evidence for the date of the Aśvacikitsita of Nakula: (Before A. D. 1000): P. K. Gode .. 127-134

PA

The Memorable Message of the Heliodorus Column at Besnagar: K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar .. 135-1

The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute—Second Foundation Day .. 138-1

Śilappadikāram: Rao Sahib S. Vaiyapuri Pillai .. 144-1

Dara Shikoh's Majma-ul-Bahrain (Samudra-Saṅgama-Grantha): Dr. V. Raghavan ... 150-1

Activities of the Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient during 1940-1945: Mlle. S. Karpeles .. 163-1

Archæological Researches in Cochinchina (S. W. Indochina) or the Discovery of Founan's Sites: Mlle. Karpeles... 169-1

The Psychology of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad: Dr. P. T. Raju ... 173-1

The Vitality and Persistence of Sanskrit: K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar ... 183-1

An Indo-British Goodwill and Cultural Mission to India ... 198-1

Supplements:

1. Pramāṇalakṣaṇa of Sarvajñātman: Edited by Panditaraja T. V. Ramachandra Diksitar and Dr. T. R. Chintamani (Continued from Vol. X). Pt. II end. 9·
2. Tolkāppiyam: Section III—Poruḷ-atikāram Edited with transliteration, translation and notes by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri. Pt. IV end. 1·

AUTHORS' INDEX

PAGES

Aiyar, R. Narayana,

The Quest of Sītā—A Critical Study of Vālmīki's technique. ... 83-109

Ayyar, K. Balasubrahmanya,

Our First President (The late Rt. Hon'ble V.S. Srinivasa Sastri) ... Pt. II. i-ii

The Late P.S. Sivaswami Iyer ... Pt. III. i-ii

The Memorable Message of the Helidorus Column at Besnagar ... 135-37

The Vitality and Persistence of Sanskrit .. 183-86

Review of 'Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa' by V. Raghavan.. 187-189

Chintamani, T.R.,

Pramāṇalakṣaṇa of Sarvajñātman. Edited jointly with Panditaraja T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar. (Continued from Vol. X). Pt. II. end. 9-16

Das Gupta, Charu Chandra,

On the Affinity between a Terracotto Figurine of the Indus Valley Age and a Stone Sculpture of the Maurya Age and Its Significance ... 21-24

Dikshitar, T.V. Ramachandra,

Pramāṇalakṣaṇam of Sarvajñātman. Edited jointly with Dr. T.R. Chintamani (Continued from Vol. X) Pt. II. end 9-16

Gode, P. K.,

Date of Prāyaścitta-candrikā of Viśvanāthabhaṭṭa, son of Narasiṁha Dīkṣita—Before A.D.1543 ... 34-36

Some Evidence for the date of the Aśvacikitsita of Nakula: (Before 1000 A. D.) ... 127-34

Hiriyanna, M.,

Gleanings from the Prakaṭārtha ... 1-8

The Doctrine of Niyoga ... 37-47

Karpeles, Mlle.,

Activities of the Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient during 1940-45 .. 167-68

PAGES

Archæological Researches in Cochinchina (S. W. Indochina) or the Discovery of Founan's Sites ... 169-72

Kosambi, D. D.,
On the Authorship of the Śatakatrayī ... 64-77

Pillai, S. Vaiyapuri,
Śilappadikāram ... 144-49

Raghavan, V.,
Indu, the Author of the Anunyāsa ... 78
On a Meaning of the word Kauśika ... 110-16
Dara Shikoh's Majma-ul-Bahrain (Samudra-Saṅgama-Grantha) .. 150-57
Reviews:
Dr. B. C. Law Volume, Pts. 1 and 2 ... 158

The Religious Basis of Forms of Indian Society, Indian Culture and English Influence, & East and West, by Ananda K. Coomaraswamy

Chandralekhā Saṭṭaka Ed. by Dr. A. N. Upadhye
Prākṛt Languages and their contribution to Indian Culture by Dr. S. M. Katre
Vedavādadvātriṁśikā by Siddhasena Divākara
Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra
Hinduism Outside India by Jagadiswarananda
Studies in the Ramayana by T. Sundaracharıar
Tolkāppiyam—Collatikāram by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri

Historical Tamil Reader by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri

Tonivilakku by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri
Cidagaganacandrikā Ed. by Pandit Karra Agnihohi Sastri
Mahabhārata tātparyaṭīkā of Devabodha, Udyoga-parvan Ed. by Dr. S. K. De

Nibandhasaṅgraha
Digvijayamahākāvya by Meghavijayagani .. 189-197

Raja, C. Kunhan,
The Payyūr Bhaṭṭas ... 13-17

Raju, P.T.,
The Pscychology of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka upaniṣad ... 173-82

PAGES

Reddy, D.V.S.,
History of Medicine in India—A Few Questions ... 79-82

Sankaran, C. R.,
The Concept of Keynote in the Taittirīya Prātiśākhya. 28-33

Sarma, K. Madhava Krishna,
Author of Anunyāsa ... 25-27

Sastri, K. A. Nilakanta,
Did Dhruva Abdicate? ... 9-12

Sastri, V. S Srinivasa,
Foreword ... Pt. I. i-ii

Sastri, P. S. Subrahmanya,
The Semantic History of the Words Nāsatyāu and Dasrāu ... 18-20
Tolkāppiyam: Section III—Poruḷ-atikāram. Edited with transliteration, translation and notes Pt. IV end 1-10

Venkataramanayya, N.,
Nandivarman II Pallavamalla: Date of Accession Reconsidered ... 117-26
Review of 'A Forgotten Chapter of Andhra History' by Somasekhara Sarma .. 83

Venkatasubbiah, A.,
Vedic Studies III: The root Śvas and Śuṣ ... 48-63

FOREWORD

The authorities of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute have resolved to revive the *Journal of Oriental Research* and issue the first number of the new series—Vol. XV. No. I—on 12th September, 1945, which is the first anniversary of its foundation and the second of the passing of the founder and first editor of the Journal *Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri.*

In presenting it to the public I would respectfully suggest to the lucky possessors of the first issue a re-perusal of the just and scholarly sentiments expressed by Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar in his admirable Foreword. It is not possible to improve upon his appeal to Indian Scholarship or its duty towards the great tasks that await it. The Journal will be the medium through which savants will make their researches known, and its conductors will be fully repaid if they use its pages with confidence and freedom. Valuable work in literary and allied fields of study is encouraged by similar agencies in well-established centres of learning like Calcutta, Benares and Poona ; and those that are responsible for the second incarnation of the *Journal of Oriental Research* have abundant faith that it will evoke the zeal and love of learning for which the South of India has always been famous and direct them into channels of fruitful and distinguished labour.

Let us recall and give due praise to the scholars who in various capacities and degrees gathered round the banner of the illustrious man, who founded and for

14 years edited the Journal with his unequalled wisdom and width of outlook. Nor can we forget the devotion and ungrudging industry with which Messrs. K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer and R. Narayanaswami Iyer maintained and nourished it through the period. From these and from fresh recruits to the service of the Journal we confidently expect a constant flow of fertilizing and enriching work.

V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI,
President,
The Kuppuswami Sastri
Research Institute, Madras.

12th September, 1945.

OURSELVES

The Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, was, as many of our subscribers know, started in the year 1927 under the supervision of an Editorial Board whose President was Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar, K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E., and of an Executive Committee, chosen from among the members of which Mr. K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer was the Managing Editor and Dr. T. R. Chintamani first and then Mr. T. Chandrasekharan, M.A., L.T., the Manager and Correspondent. The Proprietorship of the Journal was vested in the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastriar and Mr. K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer. From the year 1927, the Journal was being regularly published in four parts every year till the beginning of 1942. The Journal was received well by all Scholars throughout India and was subscribed for by many of the Libraries and Universities in India and also in England, Germany and America. Many of the important Research Journals also have been kind enough to place this Journal in their exchange list. Fourteen Volumes of the Journal have thus been published. We are glad to say that the Journal had, by this time, established a reputation as one of the important Research Journals in India.

Owing to the situation created by the War in Madras in the year 1942, the printing and publication of the Journal had to be temporarily stopped. The publication of the Journal could not be resumed even in 1943 and 1944 owing to the difficulties of printing and strict paper control. Further, owing to the irreparable loss caused to the Journal by the sad demise of the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, who was the moving spirit of the Journal, the activities of the Journal could not be resumed for some time more. But, after

the death of Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, many of his friends decided to found a Research Institute in his name as a memorial to his services, for the purpose of co-ordinating the activities carried on in Madras with regard to the promotion and propagation of our culture. It was resolved that the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, which has now been established, should take up the publication of the Journal from the 15th Volume onwards. Many of the members of the Editorial Board are also members of the Institute. The Managing Editor of the Journal Mr. K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer is now one of the Secretaries of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute. The publication of the Journal is now under the supervision of a Research Committee of the Institute of which the Secretaries of the Institute are the conveners. We hope and trust that the Journal will continue its progress in future uninterrupted and will receive the encouragement and patronage of all scholars and cultured men throughout India. We also earnestly appeal to the subscribers who have been indulgent hitherto to our shortcomings and put up with the inconvenience caused by temporary stoppage of the Journal to continue to extend their help and encouragement in the same spirit that they have done in the past.

GLEANINGS FROM THE *PRAKAṬĀRTHA*

BY

PROF. M. HIRIYANNA.

The Sanskrit Department of the Madras University has, in recent years, published for the first time several old and important works on Indian philosophy. One of them is the *Prakaṭārtha-vivaraṇa*, edited by Dr. T. R. Chintamani. It is a comparatively early commentary on the *Vedānta-sūtra-bhāṣya* of Śaṁkara, and is referred to in works like the *Siddhānta-leśa-saṁgraha* of Appayya Dīkṣita; but even the existence of manuscripts of this work was hardly known till a few years ago. The name of its author is not mentioned in the work; but Dr. V. Raghavan[1] of the same University has, of late, shown by means of arguments, which appear to be quite conclusive, that it should be the composition of Anubhūti Svarūpa who has commented upon other advaitic works also like the *Iṣṭa-siddhi*. His exposition of the doctrine here does not seem to possess much philosophic value; but he, now and again, makes side observations on the critics of Śaṁkara and on other commentators on his *bhāṣya*. These observations are often instructive. There are, as is well known, two main schools of advaitic thought, *viz.*, the Vivaraṇa and the Bhāmatī schools which differ in their views concerning certain more or less important details. The *Prakaṭārtha* generally follows the former and, as may be expected, finds fault with the latter, some of its worst criticisms being directed against Vācaspati, the founder of that school. The terms in which it refers to him may not always satisfy the test of what may be called literary decorum; but most of the criticisms are sound. The object of this paper is to draw attention to these criticisms, explaining them so far as necessary. We shall refer to them in the order in which they occur in the work.

(1) *Vedānta Sūtra*,[2] I. i. 28-31.

---

1. See *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*. Silver Jubilee Number, pp. 352-68.

2. Hereafter referred to as VS. Similarly, *Bhāmatī* and *Kalpataru*, Amalānanda's gloss on it (Nirn. Sag. Edn.), are abbreviated to B. and KT. respectively.

This *adhikaraṇa* considers the third section of the Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad, which is in the form of a dialogue between Indra and King Pratardana, and speaks of Prāṇa, the individual soul[1] and Brahman, laying much the same emphasis on each one of them. After discussing in his commentary the significance of this section as a whole, Śaṁkara concludes that it is the last of the three, *viz.*, the attributeless or *nirguṇa* Brahman that forms its essential theme, and that the object of the teaching here is to impart to us a correct knowledge of it (ब्रह्मोपदेश). Before closing the commentary on the section, however, he gives a *resume* of the opinion of an older commentator, a Vṛttikāra, who also took the section as essentially concerned with Brahman, but as enjoining meditation on it as qualified by the characteristics not only of itself but also of Prāṇa and of the individual soul. From the general tenor of this *resume*, it appears that Śaṁkara, though he would naturally prefer his own interpretation, has nothing particular to say against the other view, presumably because meditation on the qualified or *saguṇa* Brahman is recognised by him also, though not as the *final* stage in the discipline for liberation. But Vācaspati criticises the view of the Vṛttikāra as involving the defect of what is described as *vākya-bheda*, and represents it as quite unacceptable to Śaṁkara. He adds that Śaṁkara does not explicitly state anything against that view, because its untenability is patent. The *Prakaṭārtha*, which does not itself criticise the view,[2] finds fault with Vācaspati for this criticism. Since Vācaspati was a very early commentator on the *bhāṣya*, he was the first, we way assume, to express disapprobation of the view in question.

Now Amalānanda refers in this context to some (केचित्) who maintained that there was no defect of the kind, pointed out above, in the other view. His reference cannot be to the *Prakaṭārtha*, for it does not contain anything like the arguments summarised here. It therefore shows that there were once other commentators also of the Vivaraṇa school, who disagreed

---

1. There is a prominent reference to Indra also here; but we have left that out, since he also may be reckoned as a *jīva*. See Advaitānanda's *Brahma-vidyābharaṇa*.

2. This is stated on the basis of the observation in the *Prakaṭārtha*: तदेतद्वाचस्पतेर्न रोचते, which implies disagreement.

with Vācaspati and maintained the view which we have ascribed to Śaṁkara. Strangely, however, we find that scholiasts like Ānandajñāna and Rāmānanda,[1] who belong to the same school but are later, criticise the alternative interpretation in the manner of Vācaspati. If we take this fact along with the other, *viz.*, that Vācaspati was probably the first to criticise the Vṛttikāra's view, it does not seem wrong to conclude that there is here a point in the interpretation of Śaṁkara's commentary on VS., in which Vācaspati's view has gradually come to prevail among the followers of the Vivaraṇa school.

(2) *VS.* II. iii. 41-2.

In commenting on the *bhāṣya* on this *adhikaraṇa*, the *Prakaṭārtha* states that it would be difficult for Vācaspati to reconcile its conclusion with the Advaita doctrine as he understands it.

प्रेरकत्वे परेशस्य जीवस्य भ्रान्तिकर्तृता ।
जीवभ्रान्त्या परेशस्य प्रेरकत्वं सुदुर्घटम् ॥

The criticism is too brief, but it is not difficult to see what it means. It refers to the fallacy of mutual dependence between two points in Vācaspati's view of Advaita. One of them is the conclusion of the present *adhikaraṇa*, in which Vācaspati does not differ from other followers of Śaṁkara.[2] The problem discussed here is that of free will; but it is not necessary for our purpose to enter into the details of the discussion concerning it. It will suffice to note that the freedom, wh'ch man feels by instinct, as it were, that he possesses, is here admitted; only it is added that it cannot be complete freedom, since Īśvara also has an important place in the determination of human action, as in everything else which takes place in the universe. Hence the conclusion of the *adhikaraṇa*, so far as we are at present concerned with it, is that man's feeling that he is *wholly* free is a delusion. That is, the agency (कर्तृता) of the *jīva*, in the full sense of the term, is the outcome of *bhrānti*. The other point which is inconsistent with this is Vācaspati's conception of Īśvara or, to state the same otherwise, his view of the locus of *avidyā* or Māyā which is of fundamental importance in the doctrine. All advaitins agree that the *avidyā* has

1. *Cf.* Rāmānanda's remark: इयमसंगता व्याख्या.
2. *Cf.* B. II. iii. 41: सर्वव्यापारेषु जन्तूनामीश्वरतन्त्रता.

Brahman as its object (विषय); but while the Vivaraṇa school holds that it resides in Brahman, the other school maintains that it is in the *jīva*.[1] According to the former, Īśvara is a complex of spirit and *avidyā* and exists, as we may say, by his own right so far as the empirical sphere is concerned. But according to the latter, he is a consequence of the *jīva's* fancy, somewhat like a God seen in one's dream.[2] In other words, Īśvara is *jīva-kalpita* so that he would not be there at all to guide man or to do anything else without the *jīva*, even on the level of empirical being. Now if we take this together with what was stated above, *viz*., that the *jīva's* freedom is partly illusory since it wills under the control of Īśvara, we shall see that the *jīva* is both dependent upon and, at the same time, independent of Īśvara. This is the defect of reciprocal dependence pointed out in the *Prakaṭārtha*.[3]

(3) *VS*. III. i. 1-7.

This *adhikaraṇa* is concerned with the 'doctrine of the five fires' (पञ्चाग्निविद्या), which is taught in the Chāndogya[4] and the Bṛhadāraṇyaka[5] Upaniṣads and relates to the problems of rebirth; but its details are too technical to be mentioned here. We shall therefore refer to it only briefly and in general

1. See stanzas at the end of KT. on II. i. 19 and 33, and *cf*. *Siddhānta-leśa-saṁgraha*, p. 65. (Kumbhakonam Edn.).

2. The world does not thereby become a mere figment of the *jīva's* imagination, since there is (empirically speaking) an objective ground for it, *viz*. Brahman as there is an objective basis, *viz*. 'shell' for the illusory 'silver'. *Cf*. KT. अधिष्ठानं हि ब्रह्म, न जीवाः. (p. 404). It would therefore be more correct to say that ईश्वरत्व is जीवकल्पित.

3. KT. which usually refers to the *Prakaṭārtha* criticisms of Vācaspati and tries to meet them, is silent here, although it makes passing references to it elsewhere (see pp. 404 and 482). But Vācaspati himself, anticipating such a criticism of his conception of Īśvara furnishes a brief reply under I. iv. 3 (p. 378). He there represents Brahman not only as the *viṣaya* of *avidyā* but also as the *nimitta* of the latter manifesting itself as the world—a view which, in so far as it makes Brahman the *nimitta-kāraṇa*, appears to materially change his original idea of Īśvara.

4. V. iii—x.

5. VI. ii.

terms. Śaṁkara explains the *vidyā* here not as intended to set forth the course of the departed soul before it incarnates again, but as a meditation meant to advance the disciple on the way to life's goal. In explaining a certain point in the teaching, he cites[1] a parallel meditation taught in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[2] Vācaspati, however, makes no mention of this parallelism in his explanation and treats the two meditations as but one: The *Prakaṭārtha* observes that he shows here his ignorance not only of Śaṁkara's intention but also of the true import of the Brāhmaṇa text in question.[3]

This criticism does not appear to be justified. The meditations are, no doubt, separate as pointed out by nearly all the commentators; but the *bhāṣya* itself does not state it quite explicitly. It is therefore possible to say, as the *Prakaṭārtha* does, that Vācaspati missed its true meaning. But Śaṁkara discusses the same point at some length in his commentary on the corresponding portion of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[4] and concludes that the meditations should be regarded as different. Hence to admit that the *Prakaṭārtha* criticism is right would be to admit that Vācaspati was ignorant of Śaṁkara's commentary on such an important Upaniṣad as the Bṛahadāraṇyaka. That is hardly conceivable in the case of one who undertook to interpret his *bhāṣya* on VS. Hence the explanation offered in this connection by Amalānanda, it seems, should be accepted as satisfactory. He admits the separateness of the meditations, but adds that Vācaspati's deviation from the *bhāṣya* was due, not to his ignorance but to his desire to explain Śaṁkara's statement, assuming for the sake of argument (प्रौढ्या), that the two meditations are but the same.

(4) *VS.* III. iii. 26.

This *sūtra* forms an *adhikaraṇa* by itself, and discusses the condition of the sage, who has realised the ultimate truth. But the point raised in the *Prakaṭārtha* here against Vācaspati

1. See com. on *sūtra* 6.

2. XI. vi. 2 (Mādhyandina recension).

3. It is interesting to note that, if the text of the *Prakaṭārtha* is correctly printed here, its author wrongly ascribes to Yājñavalkya the reply which, according to the Brāhmaṇa, is given by Janaka.

4. VI. ii. 15. *Cf.* com. on Ch. Up. V. iv. 1.

does not concern the subject-matter of the *adhikaraṇa*. It relates to the way in which the compound *kuśāchhandasstutyupagānavat*, used in the *sūtra*, is to be split up. This expression points to four parallels, found in the ritualistic portion of the Veda, in support of the conclusion reached here. There is no doubt about the form of the last two words in it. They are *stuti* and *upagāna*. The first two are *kuśā* (fem.) and *chandas* according to commentators in general, and this division appears to have the support of Śaṁkara.[1] But Vācaspati takes the words to be *kuśa* (masc. or neut.) and *ācchandas*, explaining latter as a variant of *chandas*. The *Prakaṭārtha* remarks that he is forced to this wrong splitting of the compound owing to his ignorance of the fact that, though *kuśa* may be only masculine or neuter in form when it means 'sacred grass', it is femine when it means, as here, 'sacrificial fuel' (समित्). Amalānanda tries to defend Vācaspati against this criticism; but, for doing so, he has to lean upon the relatively slender support of Amarasimha,[2] while the *Prakaṭārtha* has the authority of Pāṇini behind it.[3]

(5) *VS.* III. iv. 47.

There is an explicit injunction in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (III. v) regarding *manana*[4] or reflection upon the ultimate truth of Vedānta, that relating to *śravaṇa*, which precedes it, being taken for granted. The question discussed here is whether the succeeding stage also of the discipline for attaining Brahma-knowledge, *viz.* meditation (ध्यान) in reference to which no injunctive term is used in the Upaniṣad, is or is not similarly enjoined. The conclusion reached by Śaṁkara is that it too is to be taken as enjoined; and Vācaspati expresses the same view in his B. The *Prakaṭārtha* points out that in doing so he contradicts himself for, in an earlier portion of the work[5],

---

1. *Cf.* आदुम्बर्यः used in the *bhāṣya* in grammatical agreement with कुशाः. Amalānanda states that Śaṁkara here is merely echoing a Vedic peculiarity (अनुकारमात्रम्).
2. अश्ली कुशं कुशो दर्भः (I. iv. 166).
3. See IV. i. 42. *Cf.* also VIII. iii. 46.
4. बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्.
5. I. i. 4. pp. 129 and 153, and *cf.* KT:

साक्षात्कारो हि दृष्टं फलं, तादर्थ्ये मननादेर्वदन् भाष्यकारो विधिं न मृष्यते ॥ (P. 152).

he has denied injunction in respect of all the *three* stages of the discipline, beginning with *śravaṇa*. It adds that in thus denying there what constitutes the essential duty of the *saṁnyāsin*, Vācaspati virtually discountenances the fourth *āśrama* and thereby deprives the Vedānta *śāstra* of its proper *adhikārin*. This is probably to overstate the case against Vācaspati, since the criticism assumes that there is complete agreement among the advaitins in this regard while, as a matter of fact, they differ a good deal from one another.[1] But, however that may be, it is clear that Vācaspati does lay himself open to the charge of inconsistency here. Amalānanda attempts to explain it in two ways. First, he points out that the injunction denied earlier in B. is of the *apūrva* type, and that the one admitted here is of the *niyama* type, so that the contradiction involved is merely apparent.[2] The second explanation is that neither Vācaspati nor Śaṁkara recognises any injunction here, and that there is accordingly no contradiction at all.

अथवा पाण्डित्यादिशब्दान्तरादप्राप्तिरपूर्वत्वम् । विधित्वं चार्थवादस्यैव सतो वाक्यस्य प्रशंसाद्वारेण प्रवृत्त्यतिशयकरत्वम् ॥ (KT. p. 919)

This attempt of Amalānanda cannot be regarded as successful, for both the explanations clearly strain the words, used by Śaṁkara and Vācaspati, viz. *apūrvatvāt* and *vidhīyate*, too much.

(6) *VS*. III. iv. 51.

The discussion here relates to the question whether, as a consequence of pursuing *śravaṇa*, *manana*, and *dhyāna*, Brahman is realised in this life or hereafter. The conclusion reached in B., as in the *bhāṣya*, is that, since the result depends upon the extent and nature of the unseen obstacles, whose removal through the performance of prescribed *karma* is necessary for it, the realisation may or may not take place in the present life. The *Prakaṭārtha* criticises Vācaspati for admitting here the possibility of Brahma-realisation being postponed to a future life, for he has previously[3] described it as having a

1. Cf. *Siddhānta-leśa-saṁgraha*, pp. 7-39.
2. See p. 919, and *cf*. *Parimala*:

एवं चाविधेयत्वमुक्तमित्यस्यापूर्वविध्यविषयत्वमुक्तमिह तु नियमविधिविषयत्वमुच्यत इति पूर्वापरविरोधपरिहारो द्रष्टव्यः ।

3. See B. pp. 114, 152-3 and 930; and *cf*. KT. श्रवणादिविधित्वनिषेधः (p. 222) and *Parimala*, (p. 154). See also passage cited in note 5 on page 6 above.

dṛṣṭa-phala or being a matter of actual experience, and as not mediated by any transcendental *apūrva*, such as is presupposed by a *vidhi*. The criticism is expressed in the following stanza:

विधिसामर्थ्यमाश्रित्य वदन्नामुष्मिकं फलम् ।
श्रवणादेः कथंकारं वाक्पतिर्न च तत्रपे ॥

But the question will arise whether what is described as a *dṛṣṭaphala* should necessarily be attained in the present life. Evidently the *Prakaṭārtha* means that it should be so. But, as Amalānanda points out, that is by no means necessary. A result, which is attained in a future life, may still be a matter of actual experience, and may not be mediated by any *apūrva* in its transcendental sense. A born musician, to cite the illustration given in this connection, may directly intuit musical truths as the result (according to the *karma* doctrine) of training in the art received by him in a former birth. It is the special aptitude (संस्कार), inherited from the past, that explains this precocity and not any *apūrva*, the result of carrying out a *vidhi*.[1] The same may well be the case in respect of Brahma-realisation also. The *Prakaṭārtha* criticism of Vācaspati in this respect does not therefore appear to be justified.

(7) *VS*. IV. iv. 17-22 :

This *adhikaraṇa* relates to *mokṣa* ; and the *Prakaṭārtha* points out that, if Vācaspati's view of the locus of *avidyā*[2] is adopted, right knowledge will not lead to release in the complete sense of the term. The reason assigned for it is that, even when one *jīva* qualifies for *mokṣa*, there will be other *jīvas* and that, on account of their *avidyā*, Brahman, and consequently the released soul also, will continue to be *saguṇa*. In other words, right knowledge may result in oneness with the personal Brahman but not with the impersonal. This charge against Vācaspati would be groundless, if he subscribed to the view, held by some advaitins, of *sarva-mukti* or the belief that no one can become finally free until all are liberated;[3] but he does not seem to do so.[4] Amalānanda makes no reference to this criticism in his commentary here.

---

1. KT. pp. 924-5.
2. See item (2) above.
3. *Siddhānta-leśa-saṁgraha*, pp. 449 ff.
4. *Cf. B.* pp. 377-8.

DID DHRUVA ABDICATE?

BY

PROF. K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI.

The accession of Govinda III to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa throne has been the subject of some discussion. There is general agreement on the main facts. Dhruva had a number of sons, and Govinda was not eldest among them. Still his father was so impressed by the extraordinary abilities of Govinda that he designated him heir apparent (Yuvarāja) to the throne, a decision which roused resentment in the mind of Govinda's elder brother Kambha who, after the death of his father, organised a great rebellion against Govinda III. It is not our object here to discuss the relations of the two brothers or the political intricacies that underlay the civil war between them. The only question proposed for consideration is whether Dhruva was content with making Govinda Yuvarāja during his life-time, or as has been held by some writers, he went further and actually abdicated the throne in favour of the son of his choice. On the latter alternative we shall have to assume that although Dhruva had given up his authority as Emperor, still he retained enough prestige to act as a check during his life-time on the ambitious projects of his disappointed first son. Let us study the evidence of the inscriptions on this question.

The inscriptions of the reign of Govinda himself are fairly clear on the subject, and if they stood by themselves there would indeed be no question for discussion at all. The Maṇṇe plates A.D. 802[1] and the Rādhānpūr plates, A.D. 808 narrate the events in identical terms. The relevant verses from these records are two. They read:

yasyā-kāram amānuṣam tri-bhuvana-vyāpatti-rakṣocitam
Kṛṣṇasyeva nirīkṣya yacchati pitaryekādhipatyam bhuvaḥ|
Āstām tāta tavaitad-apratihatā dattā tvayā kaṇṭhikā
Kin-nājñeva mayā dhṛteti pitaram yuktam vaco
yo'bhyadhāt||

1. EC. IX. Nl. 61.

Tasmin svarga-vibhūṣaṇāya janake yāte yaśaḥ-śeṣatām
Ekībhūya samudyatān vasumatī saṁhāram-āditsayā|
Vicchāyān sahasā vyadhatta nṛpatīn ekōpi yo dvādaśa
Khyātān-apyadhika-pratāpa-visaraiḥ saṁvartako' rkānivа||

Here we see that Govinda's father noticed the superhuman form of Govinda which like that of Krishṇa appeared capable of protecting the three worlds, and so he offered to bestow on Govinda the sole sovereignty of the world (*i.e.*) he offered to abdicate and make him monarch at once. Govinda's reply to his father, commended as very próper (yuktam vacaḥ) by the composer of the praśasti was "let the sovereignty be yours, father; have I not borne the necklace given by you as if it were a command unchallengeable?". Closely interpreted this verse means that Govinda had been installed as Yuvarāja for sometime, when Dhruva actually contemplated abdication and consulted his son. But Govinda opposed the project and begged that his father might continue to rule. The father apparently acceded to the wish. The next verse takes up the story after the demise of the father. It says that 12 mighty kings banded themselves together and sought to deprive Govinda of the kingdom. But Govinda's superior prowess spoiled their designs, and in a powerful simile the poet compares the twelve enemies of Govinda to the twelve Ādityas and Govinda himself to the 'Saṁvartaka fire' which outshines the Ādityas and destroys the universe.

It is possible that in his life-time Dhruva began to entertain suspicions of the coming struggle and made an attempt to abort it by promoting Govinda from the position of Yuvarāja to that of the Emperor himself. But that did not happen, thanks to Govinda himself, and when the anticipated struggle came on Govinda proved equal to it and came out successful.

It is notable that Govinda's elder brother Kambha, the leader of the rebellion, is not mentioned by name, and Govinda seems to have treated his brother with consideration after suppressing his rebellion, and given him back the governorship of the Gangavāḍi province as we see from the Maṇṇe plates.

Later inscriptions, particularly, those of the Guzerat branch give a slightly different account of what happened. Thus in the Surat plates of Karka Suvarṇavarṣa A.D. 821 we read:.[1]

1. EI. 21 pp. 142-3 verses 30-31 = Kavi plates verse 27-28 IA. V. p. 147.

Rājyā-bhiṣeka kalaśaiḥ abhiṣicya dattām
Rājādhirāja-parameśvaratām sva-pitrā ।
Anyair-mahā nṛpatibhirbahubhis-sametya
Stambādibhir bhujabalād-avalupyamānām ॥

Ekoneka-narendra-bṛnda-sahitān yastān samastānapi
Protkhātāsi-latā-prahāra-vidhurān baddhvā mahā-saṁyuge ।
Lakṣmī-mapyacalām-cakāra-vilasat-saccāmara-grāhiṇīm
Samsīdad-guru-vipra-sajjana-suhṛd-bandhūpa-bhogyām bhuvi ॥

These verses obviously narrate the same events as the verses from Maṇṇe and Rādhānpūr plates cited above. The most important variation is the direct statement with which they open namely that Govinda received from his father the headship of the empire at the time of his rājyābhiṣeka. The wording of the text clearly states that the coronation of Govinda was witnessed by his father, and that the coronation was of Govinda as Emperor and not as Yuvarāja. Then follows the statement that other great kings banded themselves together under the leadership of Stambha, and sought to wrest the kingdom from Govinda, but single-handed Govinda fought against them all, and having taken them prisoners established himself firmly on the throne. The omission of Stambha's name from the Maṇṇe and Rādhānpūr plates and its express mention here are quite intelligible. Govinda evidently did not like to remind himself or his brother of their former differences after their reconciliation at the end of the war. No such consideration prevailed with the composer of the plates of the Guzerat line.

But the main question is—Was Govinda crowned Emperor during his father's life-time? Did Dhruva abdicate the throne in favour of Govinda and live for sometime after his abdication? It must be confessed that a categorical answer does not appear easy, for if we turn to the verses from the grants of the main line after our study of the verses from the later records, we cannot fail to notice a significant gap in their account. Govinda indeed told his father that he should retain the place of Emperor during his lifetime, while Govinda himself continued to be Yuvarāja, but did the father adopt the son's suggestion? There is no direct answer to this question in those

verses which, after recording Govinda's speech with appreciation, simply turn to narrate the rebellion after Dhruva's death. The Surat plates on the other hand which are less than two decades later in date state expressly that Dhruva did transfer the empire to Govinda, and witnessed the performance of his abhiṣeka as Emperor, and there is no reason to doubt the clear testimony of this record which is not contradicted by that of the records of the main line. So the best way of reconciling all the data at our disposal would be to assume that after Govinda had been Yuvarāja for sometime, Dhruva anticipated trouble from the disappointed Kambha and wanted to forestall it by making Govinda Emperor in his own right, and though Govinda opposed it, Dhruva put the plan through and did make Govinda Emperor in his own life-time. His hope of averting a civil war was fulfilled during his life-time, but the war broke out at his death as the Maṇṇe and Rādhānpūr plates distinctly affirm.

It may be noted finally that verses (6) and (7) of the Kapaḍvanj grant of Kṛṣṇa II[1] are quite neutral as between the two versions, and contain nothing to contradict the interpretation offered above.

1. EI. I, p. 54.

THE PAYYŪR BHAṬṬAS

BY

DR. C. KUNHAN RAJA

The great Mīmāṃsakas of the Payyūr family in Malabar must be well known by this time to all students of Sanskrit literature. The commentary on the *Sphoṭasiddhi* of Maṇḍana Miśra called the *Gopālikā*[1] and the commentary on the *Tattvabindu* of Vācaspati Miśra called the *Tattvavibhāvanā*[2] are already available in print. These two commentaries are by one Parameśvara, son of Ṛṣi and Gopālikā. He has also written commentaries on the *Vibhramaviveka* of Maṇḍana Miśra and on the *Nītitattvāvirbhāva* of Cidānanda. His grandfather, son of Gaurī and Ṛṣi, named Parameśvara has commented on the *Nyāyakaṇikā*; and his grandson (son of another Ṛṣi) is also a Parameśvara and has commented on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras* and on the *Kāśikā* of Sucarita Miśra. Thus six generations of scholars are known in that family, as great authorities on Mīmāṃsā and as writers on the Mīmāṃsā literature. Those who have not actually written works are also spoken of as great scholars in the *Śāstra*. Besides, they were great figures in poetry also. Many *Yamaka Kāvyas* are known as works of some of these great scholars. The commentary on the *Meghadūta*, called the *Sumanoramaṇī* has also now come to light[3]. The *Sumanoramaṇī* mentions *Haricaritakāvya* as another work of the author. The contribution of these Bhaṭṭas to Mīmāṃsā literature is, both in volume and depth, worthy of adoration, and as such, it is a matter of great importance to know something more about these great scholars and their family. Parameśvara II (son of Ṛṣi and Gopālikā) says that the works of Maṇḍana Miśra had established themselves completely in that family[4].

1. Madras University Sanskrit Series.
2. Annamalai University Sanskrit Series.
3. Adyar Library Bulletin, February 1945.
4. मण्डनाचार्यकृतयो येष्वतिष्ठन्त कृत्स्नशः । तद्वंश्येन मया ।

There is a *Sandeśa Kāvya* which throws some light on this famous family. It is called the *Cakorasandeśa*. A manuscript of it is available in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras (No. R. 3607). There is no direct evidence to connect this poem with the Payyūr family. But there are evidences that give a fair amount of probability to the poem being the work of a member of this family. The destination at which the *Sandeśa Kāvya* ends is the temple called Vedāraṇya. Now, all the *Yamaka Kāvyas* by the members of the Payyūr family and the *Mīmāṃsā* works contain references to a Vedāraṇya. There is a temple called Velaṅgāḍ near the modern family residence of these Bhaṭṭas, which is in a village called Porkalam (usually mentioned in Sanskrit as Raṇakhala) about sixteen miles to the North West of Trichur in the Cochin State. In the *Sandeśa Kāvya*, the temple is spoken of as a seat of learning.[1] The Deity in the temple is Gopālikā[2] and the Payyūr Bhaṭṭas worship the Deity in Vedāraṇya, in their works, as Gopālikā. From these references one naturally gets an impression that the Vedāraṇya of the *Sandeśa Kāvya* and the Vedāraṇya of the Payyūr Bhaṭṭas are identical.

The only difficulty is that while the Vedāraṇya of the Bhaṭṭas is sixteen miles Noth West of Trichur, the Vedāraṇya of the *Sandeśa Kāvya* is much to the north of Tirunāvāy on the Ponani River, (Nilā) *i.e.*, at least twenty miles further to the north of the Vedāraṇya of the Bhaṭṭas. Tirunāvāy is about twelve miles to the north of the family residence of the Bhaṭṭas. In the *Sandeśa Kāvya* there is a description of

---

1. कृष्णद्वैपायनमुनिकृता भारताख्या कथा सा
देवीमाहात्म्यमपि महितं तत्पुराणान्तरं च ।
श्रीमद्रामायणवरकथा सापि वाल्मीकिगीता
श्रूयेरंस्ते श्रवणसुभगा ह्यागमाश्चापि सर्वाः ॥ 161

भूयो वेदांश्चतुर ऋपिभिर्मानुपैश्चेर्यमाणम् ॥ 162

मन्वादेर्गां शृणु च पदवाक्यात्मभाष्याणि टीकां
सूत्रवातान्यपि मुनिकृतान्युल्लसद्वार्तिकानि ।
काव्यं श्राव्यं शृणु च मधुरं नाटकं चापि नाना-
भूतं भूतं रमयदखिलं कालिदासादिभूतम् ॥ 162

देवी गोपाल्यपि जयतु सा (last verse)

Tirunāvāy; after that are mentioned Śvetāṭavī and a lake named Adri[1]; and Vedāraṇya comes after that.

In Calicut there is a temple called Tiru-velaṅgāḍ. I made inquiries to know if there is any evidence of the Payyūr Bhaṭṭas having settled down in their present village after migrating from a more northern home. But no such tradition is available. The well-known Mīmāṃsakas lived in the second half of the fourteenth century and the first half of the fifteenth century. There is evidence to show that this *Sandeśa Kāvya* is much earlier, perhaps by two centuries, than the time of the famous Bhaṭṭas.

It is not possible to settle the date of the *Sandeśa Kāvya* with any degree of certainty. It is full of information about ancient Malabar. But there is nothing that points to any definite date. In a place a few miles to the south east of the present Tripunithura (the residence of the Maharajas of Cochin) there is mention of a temple where it is not known whether it is dedicated to Śiva or Viṣṇu and about which there were at that time five doubts.[2] Apart from the doubt already mentioned in the verse, I am told that another doubt is whether there is a river or a lake in that place. The place is now known as Nāyattoṭṭam. Here the temple is equally important for both Śiva and Viṣṇu. The doubt about the lake or river is also known among the people of the place. In the temple of Airāṇikkulam near Cranganore, the idol of the Devi is mentioned in the *Kāvya* as occasionally found in her periods.[3] The story of how a poor Brahmin went into the temple of Kāli at dead of night at Cranganore and how the Goddess herself saved him is also mentioned.[4]

---

1. नावाक्षेत्रं श्रितानिलमपि श्वेतपूर्वाटवी सा । 150
पश्येः सरसिजयुतं साद्रिसंज्ञं सरोऽन्यम् । 162
2. तस्मात् प्राच्यां श्रुतिविलसितं धाम शम्भोर्हरेर्वा
भूतिं बिभ्रद्विदुरिह जनाः संशयान् यत्र पञ्च । 93
3. अत्याश्चर्यं भवति किल तत्राम्बिका पुष्पयुक्ता
काले कालेऽसृगितवसना दृश्यते हन्त मर्त्यैः ॥ 162
4. अत्याश्चर्यं परमिह वयं शुश्रुमाम्बानिवासे
प्राप्तः कश्चिन्निशि कुमतिना प्रेषितः केनचित्तु ।
विप्रोऽजानन् क्षुधमपि गतः श्रान्तिमांस्तेन चोक्तः
काल्याहूता दिशति वनिता भोजनादीति साधुः ॥
प्राप्ते तस्मिन्नथ निजगृहं निश्यनाप्ये मनुष्ये-
र्देवी यत्तांस्तदभिहतये स्वाङ्गनान् वारयन्ती ।

To the south of the famous Guruvāyūr temple there is a village called Pālayūr. Here the *Kāvya* mentions a Śiva temple;[1] at present there is only a Christian Church, which according to the tradition of the Church was founded by St. Thomas, the Apostle. In the Guruvāyūr temple itself, the Kāvya mentions a Śiva shrine in the southern side, along with Gaṇeśa.[2] Now there is only a Gaṇeśa shrine on the south-western corner. But even now when people worship in that shrine, they salute Śiva also, though there is no Śiva idol in shrine.

The temple of Mūkkola (known as Muktisthala in Sanskrit works) is mentioned as between the dominions of two kings, named Śaṅkara and Ārya.[3] The western side of this temple is the famous Vanneri country and the present Rajas of Punnattūr, who are supposed to be the kings of this country, have the name Goda Śaṅkara. On the eastern side of the temple is the Talappilli country; and my own family, which is supposed to be the royal family of Talappilli (also of Cittilappilli to the South of Talappilli) has the title of Ayyan (Sanskrit: Ārya).

कारुण्येता स्वयमुपगता केरलेशेन दत्ते-
नाम्रेणान्नं सहितमपि दत्त्वाभ्यरक्षत् किलेयम् ॥ 119, 120

1. गच्छेः सप्तच्छदपदयुतं भूप्रदेशं पुरःस्थं
पश्येः शर्वं सहगिरिसुतं भूतिराजत्पुरस्थम् ।
नानारत्नैर्लसितममितैर्धन्यवासोमुखैर-
प्यर्के श्रीमन्नगरवरमाभाति यस्येश्वरस्य ॥ 135.

सप्तच्छद=a tree (*pāla* in malayalam). There is no such town to the east (अर्के) of the temple now.

2. पार्श्वे चास्य द्विरदवदनं दक्षिणे देवमार्यं
चार्यां देवीं शिवदिशि च सत्संपदोदक् सरश्च । 136.

All the other features continue even now.

3. प्राप्यं देव्या निलयनमितो योजनाध्वन्यतीते
प्राच्यामीषच्छशिदिशि पुरे भूपयोरन्तराले ।
एको नाम्ना क्षितिभृदनयोः शङ्करस्त्वार्यनामा
चान्यः सार्थं किल तदुभयोर्नाम धाम्नोर्गुणानाम् ॥
याभ्यां क्षोणीभरणकरणक्रान्तिरस्तार्यकूर्म-
क्रोडात्मश्रीपतिभुजगपर्यायका (?) दिग्गजानाम् ।
भूरक्षिभ्यामनवमगुणैर्भ्रातृभिर्यौवराज्ये
सद्भिः पुत्रैरपि च सहशैर्धर्मतः संयुताभ्याम् ॥ 143, 144.

Further to the north there is a temple called Śrī Dhī Grāma, which can be identified with Tiru Manaś Śeri. At present it is a temple that belongs to the Brahmins of the Panniyūr village, who were excommunicated for the sin of having burnt up the idol of Varāha in their temple. Later literature speaks of the sin, but in the present work there is no mention of any such sin committed by them. Thus it is likely that the *Kāvya* is prior to this event. Even Malayalam works that can be assigned to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries speak very harshly about the Brahmins of Panniyūr village for their great crime. It is possible to assign this *Sandeśa* to a time earlier than this. Thus about eleven hundred after Christ may be a safe date for this work.

If this be so, it is possible that the Payyūr Bhaṭṭas had their home much to the north, near Calicut and that they migrated at a later period to their present home. The temple at Ūragam (known as Valaya South of Trichur) is supposed to be dedicated to the Deity of Tiru-Velaṅgāḍ near Calicut. Payyūr Bhaṭṭas too might have migrated a little to the south and built a temple there for their Family Deity, Gopālikā. The name Payyūr itself seems to have been given to the family after the Deity Gopālikā (Payyūr means "Cow-village"). The Kings of Koṭṭayam in Malabar are known to have been the first patrons of Mīmāṃsā in Malabar[14]. We have no evidence about the original boundary of their country. Tiru-Velaṅgāḍ is not very far to the south from the Koṭṭayam regions and it is possible that the temple once belonged to them. If this were so, it is equally likely that the Payyūr Bhaṭṭas had their original home in their country and that they migrated to the south at a later date. Their present home is within the Talapilli country and the kings of this country were also great patrons of learning.[15] From the evidence available from this *Sandesa Kāvya*, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the Payyūr Bhaṭṭas had their home near Tiru-Velaṅgāḍ near Calicut and that the *Sandeśa Kāvya* is by a member of that family, when located in that region.

14 प्रत्यापत्तिः पतग यदुपशं च कौमारिलानाम्

Kokila Sandeśa of Uddaṇḍa I—44.

15. See Introduction to *Mayūra Sandeśa*, Poona Oriental Series. Talappilli and Chittilapilli kings were the same; *Candrotsava* in Malayalam speaks of the king of Chittilappalli as Kalpakavṛkṣa for poets.

SEMANTIC HISTORY OF THE WORDS NĀSATYĀU AND DASRĀU.

BY

DR. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, M.A., PH.D.,

Annamalai University.

Nāsatyāu and *dasrāu* are now considered synonymous with *aśvināu*[1]. But the following quotation from the *Bṛhaddevatānukramaṇī* by *Sāyaṇa*[2] reveals that they were not so at the time of the author of the *Anukramaṇī*.

नासत्यश्चैव दस्रश्च यौ तु तावश्विनाविति ।

This tells us that नासत्य was the name of one *āśvin* and दस्र the name of another. If that be so, it is worth trying to account for the semantic change of the words *nāsatyāu* and *dasrāu*.

It is clearly seen from literature that the full name of a person is mentioned first and later on a part of it, for the sake of brevity.[3] This is the order of the day in colloquial speech. Mostly the curtailed form gets greater currency. The same seems to be the history of the words *nāsatyāu* and *dasrāu*.

In the vedas when two devatās are invoked, the names of both of them are used in *dvandva* compounds with or without *tmesis*.[4] In such compounds both the words which form into a *dvandva* compound originally took the dual suffix of all cases and later on the former member took the suffix of the nom.

---

1. Nāsatyāvaśvināu dasrāu (Amarakośa)
2. In the bhāṣya under अथर्ववेद 541, 53.
3. देवदत्तो दत्तः सत्यभामा भामा इति (महाभाष्यम् 1, 1, 1)
4. द्यावापृथिवी विचरान्ति तन्थवः

   (R. V. V, 63, 2)

   द्यावाचिदस्मै पृथिवी नमेते

   (*ibid*, II, 12, 13)

   इन्द्रा को वां वरुणा सुम्नमाप स्तोमः

   (*ibid*, IV, 41. 8)

voc. accu., and the latter member, the suffix of all cases.[1] Sometimes one of the two words is used with the dual suffix in the place of compounds to denote both the objects.[2] Such are called elliptic duals.

In the following Ṛks the words *nāsatyā* and *dasrā*[3] are used with tmesis:—

दस्रा युवाकवः सुता नासत्या वृक्तबर्हिषः । आयातं रुद्रवर्तनी ॥

(R. V. I 3, 3)

युवां गोतमः पुरुमीळ्हो अत्रिर्दस्रा हवतेऽवसे हविष्मान् ।
दिशं न दिष्टामृजूयेव यन्ता मे हवं नासत्योप यातम् ॥

(*ibid*, I 183, 5)

In the following Ṛks *dasrā* and *nāsatyā* are used as elliptic duals:—

दस्रा हि विश्वमानुषङ्मक्षूभिः परिदीयथः

(R. V. VIII 26, 6)

नासत्या कुह चित्सन्तौ ।

(*ibid*, I 184, 1)

In course of time *dasrāu* and *nāsatyāu* which are dual in form should have been mistaken to refer to the two *aśvins*. This, it seems, should have taken place long before Yāskaś time since we find the following statement in Yāska's *Nirukta*.

---

1. प्रमित्रयोर्वरुणयोः स्तामो न एतु शूष्यः :

(R. V. VII, 66, 1)

वित्रावरुणयोर्भाग रथ

(A. V. X 5, 12)

मित्रावरुणाभ्यां त्वा

(V. S. VII, 9)

2. द्यावा च यत्र पीपयन्नहा च (R. V.VII. 65, 2)

पुनर्ये चक्रुः पितरा युवाना ।

(*ibid*, IV 33, 3)

आ मातरा भरति

(*ibid*, IV 22, 4)

मातरापितरा नू चिदिष्टौ

(*ibid*, IV 6, 7)

3. नासत्या and दस्रा were used as duals in vedas side by side with नासत्यौ and दस्रौ, The former pair have become obsolete.

सत्यावेव नासत्यौ इति और्णनाभः

सत्यस्य प्रणेतारौ इति आग्रायणः

It is a surprise to note that *Sāyaṇa* who quotes the line

नासत्यश्चैव दस्रश्च यौ तु तावश्विनाविति

under 541, 53 in the Atharvaveda says under I, 3, 3 in the Ṛgveda

दस्रौ – शत्रूणामुपक्षयितारौ, यद्वा देववैद्यत्वेन रोगाणामुपक्षयितारौ.

Perhaps this may be due to the fact that the author of the bhāṣya of the Ṛgveda may have been different from that of the Atharvaveda.

The causes for the semantic change of *nāsatyāu* and *dasrāu* mentioned above will, I hope, serve as a point for scrutiny by scholars.

ON THE AFFINITY BETWEEN A TERRACOTTA FIGURINE OF THE INDUS VALLEY AGE AND A STONE-SCULPTURE OF THE MAURYA AGE AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

BY

CHARU CHANDRA DAS GUPTA, M.A., P.R.S.

It is well-known that the stone-sculptures of the Maurya age, which have been discovered uptil now, may be divided into two classes, *viz.*, (a) the sculptures made according to indigenous tradition and (b) the sculptures in which the extra-Indian element is distinctly prominent. Among all the sculptures belonging to the first group there are the following specimens which are most noteworthy, *viz.*, the Patna headless male figure[1], the Patna male figure[2], the Parkham male figure[3], the Didarganj female figure[4], and the Besnagar female figure[5]. If anybody carefully makes a comparative study of the modelling and the linear, composition of these figures

Fig. 1.

1. Early Indian Sculpture. By L. Bachhofer, pl. 10, the left fig.
2. *Ibid.*, pl. 10, the right fig.
3. *Ibid.*, pl. 11.
4. *Ibid.*, pl. 9
5. Hist. Ind. Indonesian Art. By A. K. Coomaraswamy, pl. III, no. 8. Messrs. Coomaraswamy (*Ibid.*, p. 16) and Kramrisch (Indian Sculpture, p. 10) ascribe this specimen to the Maurya age but Dr. Bachhofer (*op. cit.*, pp. XXVIII, 39) has ascribed it to the Śuṅga age.

he will find that they are bound by a tie of fundamental similarity. The origin of these specimens was wrapped up in obscurity until recent time; but with the discovery of the plastic art of the Indus valley age there have arisen a number of new and important data which throw a great deal of light on this problem. For example, Dr. Kramrisch has shown that there is a fundamental affinity between the two above-mentioned Patna male figures and the Harappa male torso of the Indus Valley age and has concluded that "the majestic portliness of the two headless figures from Patna (Fig. 2) is directly derived from the tenser bodily vigour of the Harappa statuette.[1]" The object of this short note is to show that there is fundamental affinity between the Didarganj female figure of the Maurya age and one Mohenjo-daro terracotta female figurine of the Indus Valley age, that the Didarganj female figure may be said to have been derived from the Mohenjo-daro terracotta female figurine and the technique of the Indus Valley pre-Maurya age.

Fig. 2.

Let us describe these two specimens one by one. The Didarganj female figure was discovered in a place of the same name in Patna district in Bihar. It is a monolithic sculpture

1. Indian Sculpture, p. 9. Dr. Kramrisch has called both specimens as headless; but, as has been shown above, one of these two specimens is headless and the other has the head preserved. Further if we make a comparative study of the modelling and the linear composition of the two Patna male figures and the Parkham male figure, we shall conclude that they are bound by fundamental similarity and consequently belong to the same class. Therefore the above remark of Dr. Kramrisch regarding the relation of the Harappa male torso to the Patna male figures is also applicable to the Parkham male figure.

representing a standing female figure. Its left arm is mutilated. Its upper body is bare but its lower body is clothed. Its hair is beautifully dressed. It has open eyes, clearly marked eye-brows, sensitive lips and developed breasts. It wears the highly ornamental head-dress, ear-rings, necklace, wristlet, waist-belt, and anklet. There is a fan-like thing in the right hand. (Figs. 1 & 2).[1]

The Mohenjo-daro female figurine was unearthed in a place of the same name in Larkana district in Sind. Regarding the actual findspot of this specimen Dr. Mackay remarks that it has been "found 2 feet below surface in Chamber 15, House IV, Block two Section B, DK Area."[2] Sir John Marshall has shown that the seven strata from 1 foot to 39 feet below the present surface-level at Mohenjo-daro belong to the Indus Valley age[3]. From the above-mentioned statement of Dr. Mackay it is understood that this figurine has been found two feet below surface at Mohenjo-daro. Therefore it may rightly be ascribed to the Indus Valley age. It represents a standing female figurine whose arms and lower body are mutilated. Its upper body is bare but there is a loin-cloth round the waist. It has round eyes, clearly marked eye-brows, broad nose and developed breasts. It wears a head-dress, ear-rings, necklace, armlet and girdle (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3.

1. As the Mohenjo-daro terracotta female figurine is broken from a little above the knee, an illustration of the Didarganj female figure upto a little above the knee (fig. 2) has been intentionally reproduced in order to show distinctly the fundamental similarity between these two specimens.

2. Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilisation. Edited by J. Marshall, Vol. I, p. 346, Vol. III, pl. XCIV, 14.

3. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 124.

A comparative study of these two specimens shows that there is a fundamental affinity between them. If we make a comparative study of the linear composition of both these specimens, we find the following points of affinity. Firstly, in both these specimens there is a curve, in each end of the chest, which extends from the shoulder-end to the waist-end. It is this curve which has made the waist slim and the buttocks heavy. Secondly, the shoulder-line of both these specimens is slightly curved. If we make a comparative study of the modelling of both these specimens, we find that the modelling of breasts of both these specimens is similar. Let us now make a comparative study of the ornaments worn by these two specimens. Both have the head-dress, ear-rings, necklace and girdle. It is true that there is some stylistic difference so far as the ornaments of each specimen are concerned; but, in this connection, the remarkable affinity between these two specimens, so far as the placing of the necklaces is concerned, is to be carefully noted. The Mohenjo-daro figurine wears five necklaces. One of them is dog-collared, the second flows over the chest, the third and the fourth flow over the chest between the breasts and the fifth flows over the breasts. The Didarganj figure, on the other hand, wears three necklaces. One of them is dog-collared and the other two flow over the chest between the breasts. The fact that some necklaces flow over the chest between the breasts in both these specimens is extremely important and show that there is fundamental similarity between these two specimens.

It is evident from the above discussion that the Didarganj female figure is possibly derived from the Mohenjo-daro female figurine. It is also important to note that there is a marked development in the linear composition and the modelling of the Didarganj female figure. This is quite natural as it belongs to a later age. Mohenjo-daro is situated in Larkana district in Sind in Western India and Didarganj is situated in Patna district in Bihar in Eastern India. Therefore from the evidence supplied by the fundamental affinity between the Mohenjo-daro female figurine and the Didarganj female figure and the find-spot of these two specimens it should be plausibly concluded that the technique of the Indus Valley sculpture penetrated into Eastern India in the post-Indus Valley pre-Maurya age.

AUTHOR OF THE ANUNYĀSA

BY

K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA, M.O.L.,

Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner.

The Anunyāsa is now known to us only through references to it in such later works as the Durghaṭavṛtti, the Jñāpaka-samuccaya, etc. I am not aware of the existence of a Ms. of this work. If it exists in any private collection, it has not yet come to light. A wrong view that it is identical with the Tantrapradīpa, a work of Maitreyarakṣita, is current among scholars. Aufrecht in his C.C. Vol. I, p. 16, has the following entry with regard to this.

"अनुन्यास or तन्त्रप्रदीप (q. v.),

a C. on Jinendra's Kāśikāvivararaṇapañcikā by Maitreyacrakṣita. . . . ."

In his Introduction to the Kāśikāvivaraṇapañcikā (Nyāsa) p. 19, Srish Chandra Chakravarti says: "Some say that this तन्त्रप्रदीप is probably identical with the Anunyāsa. माधवाचार्य often refers to it by the name of वृत्तिप्रदीप after the भाष्यप्रदीप by कैयट". On the other hand, Dr. Belvalkar, in his Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, p. 39 n., says that he has not been able to verify the fact that Maitreyarakṣita has written a commentary on the Nyāsa. There is no mention of the Anunyāsa here and the problem of its identity with the Tantrapradīpa thus does not seem to have arisen for Dr. Belvalkar. I am here concerned only with the authorship of the Anunyāsa and not with the works which Maitreyarakṣita wrote. As regards the latter, I shall give all the available evidence in a separate paper.

There are some grammatical works which, having been superseded by better ones, are now scarcely read even by students of Vyākaraṇa, a fact which explains the loss of some early works. One such work is Sīradeva's Paribhāṣāvṛtti which, having been superseded by Nāgeśa's Paribhāṣenduśekhara, is not now popular. The Paribhāṣāvṛtti was published in

the Benares Sanskrit Series, 1887. Sīradeva is quoted in Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti of the 15th century and himself quotes Puruṣottamadeva (pp. 19, 165 and 175 of the Benaras ed.) of the 12th century. He has therefore to be dated in the 13th century. Dr. Belvalkar (*Ibid.*, p. 55) gives the lower limit but not the upper one which is given here for the *first time*.

The Paribhāṣāvṛtti contains evidence that the Anunyāsa is not the work of Maitreyarakṣita but of Indu, a grammarian who is quoted in the *Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti* also. In two places in this work, the Anunyāsakāra and Maitreyarakṣita are mentioned as holding rival views on certain points. These are the following:—

अत एव "उपदेशोऽजनुनासिक इत्" (१-३-२) इत्यतो "लशक्वतद्धिते" (१-३-८) इत्यत्रेद्ग्रहणानुवृत्तावप्यनुनासिकग्रहणं नानुवर्तते । उपदेशग्रहणानुवर्तनं प्रति रक्षितानुन्यासयोर्विवाद एव । तथा हि गाङ्कुटादि (१-२-१) सूत्रेऽनुन्यासकारेणोक्तम्—आदेशपक्ष इद्ग्रहणमनर्थकम् ; आदेर्हि भवतो "लशक्वतद्धिते" (१-३-८) इत्यनेनैवेत्संज्ञायाः सिद्धत्वादित्यादि । रक्षितेन तूक्तमादिभूतो ङकारः................ ॥

(Pp. 28—29)

अत एव "आशिते भुवः करणभावयोः" (३-२-४५) इत्यत्र यदुक्तं न्यासकृता—घञं सारूप्याद्बाधते खच् । ल्युट्प्रत्ययः पुनर्वासरूपविधिना भवत्येव । आशितंभवम्, आशितभवनम्—इति तदुपपद्यते । एतस्मिन् वाक्ये इन्दुमैत्रेययोः शाश्वतिको विरोधः । तथा हि प्रत्ययसूत्रेऽनुन्यासकार उक्तवान् प्रतियन्त्यनेनार्थानिति प्रत्ययः । एरच् (३-३-५६) इत्यच् । पुंसि संज्ञायां घः प्रायेण (३-३-११८) इति वा घ इति । मैत्रेयः पुनराह—पुंसि संज्ञायाम् (३-३-११८) इति घप्रत्यय एव । एरच् (३-३-५६) इत्यच्प्रत्ययस्तु, करणे ल्युटा बाधितत्वान्न शक्यते कर्तुम् । न च वासरूपविधिरस्ति, क्तल्युडित्यादिवचनात्........... ॥

(P. 79)

From these statements it is evident that Maitreyarakṣita and Indu were two different persons, that both commented upon the Nyāsa and that it is the commentary of Indu which is called Anunyāsa.

There appear to have been many authors of the name or surname Rakṣita, but only two of them are definitely known to have been grammarians. Maitreyarakṣita and Sarvarakṣita. The latter is connected with the Durghaṭavṛtti of Śaraṇadeva and is later than the former, *i,e.*, Maitreyarakṣita. Aufrecht, C.C. I, 482, mentions also one Śākyarakṣita and one Aparājitarakṣita, both poets. From the distinct references in the Durghaṭavṛtti to the Anunyāsakāra and Sarvarakṣita, it is obvious that this Rakṣita has no connection with the Anunyāsa. In fact, I have not come across anything which might wrongly associate a Rakṣita with this work and am at a loss to know how the wrong view gained ground.

THE CONCEPT OF KEYNOTE IN THE TAITTIRIYA PRATIŚAKHYA

BY

C. R. SANKARAN, M.A.

Poona

(*Continued from page 309, Vol. XIV*)

This conjecture seemed to be prompted by the fact that Haug in a communication from India to the journal of the German Oriental Society (Ueber die Vedis-chen Accente Von Dr. Haug. ZDMG. Vol. XVII, 1863, p. 799 ff.) wrote that the modern Hindu writers of the Veda give tonic distinction only to the syllables that have the accent signs, the *svarita* and *anudātta* so that the *udātta* appears to be no accent at all, and is entirely confounded with the toneless *pracaya*—thus, under the influence of the mode of written designation, turning topsyturvy, as it were, the whole system of spoken accent.

Whitney's remarks in his article "On the Nature and Designation of the Accent in Sanskrit" in Transactions of the American Philological Association 1869—70 (pages 37—39), I reproduce here "Is the mode of designation posterior to the theory? Did the Hindus leave the *pracaya* grave syllables unmarked, like acute, because *they gave them the tone of acute, so that the identity of treatment is due to a perceived identity of character? Or, on the other hand,* was *the omission of a part of the marks indicating* grave tone made for the sake of convenience, of brevity, and is the theory an afterthought, suggested by the identity of designation, and aiming to establish a corresponding identity of character?

"The obstacle in the way of our accepting the doctrine of the *pracaya-accent* is the seeming impossibility of working it in as a part of the general accentual system."

"The acute is a syllable which is accented or rendered conspicuous by being lifted above the lower or grave tone of utterance, but what does this distinction amount to, if the grave syllables are also to be raised, even in masses, to the same level? What a strange grave tone is that which can only

maintain itself by the help of an immediately following acute. What are we to think of the independent circumflex, made by the combination of an acute and grave element, when the grave syllable, even without the encouragement of an acute joined with it, can hardly be laid down at grave pitch, but is constantly rising to the higher plane of utterance? Yet worse, what sort of an enclitic accent is that which leads down the voice from acute pitch, no whither, since, the moment the transition is past, the voice leaps back again to acute?

The last of these difficulties, and the most insurmountable of them, seems to have been felt by the Hindu theorizers themselves, who have made a very curious attempt to avoid it: namely, by shifting the circumflex itself to a higher plane."

But I hear from scholars like Mr. P. S. Sundaram Aiyar of Tanjore that this is not the case and on the other hand there are well-read Sanskrit scholars—*Śrautins*—in the south, who are able to distinguish clearly the *udātta* from *pracaya* in utterance.

Suppose we represent empirically *anudātta* by $\frac{1}{2}$ and *udātta* by 1, then in the independent circumflex, if we take it as a whole, it will have to be represented by $1\frac{1}{2}$; but if we analyse the circumflex into its constituents then it would come to be represented by $1+\frac{1}{2}$. Hence is Pāṇini's sūtra

तस्यादित उदात्तमर्धह्रस्वम् (P. I, 2, 32)[1].

It is therefore natural that the first part of the *svarita* rises to a higher plane of utterance in *saṁhitā* (continued utterance) than the *udātta*, while the second part is uttered at the level of acute and although, in the pre-vedic period, the enclitic *svarita*, might perhaps have been a middle tone, during the historical period, it certainly came to be identified with the independent circumflex.

As the acute is a syllable which is accented or rendered conspicuous by being lifted above the lower or grave tone of

---

1. Compare, "simple tones are dull. When they are compared with compound tones of the same pitch, we are inclined to estimate the compound as belonging to a higher octave than the simple tones."

Vide Helmholtz, The Sensations of Tone, page 62.

utterance, it came to be viewed as possessing उत्क्षिप्तविशिष्ट उदात्तश्रुति. But प्रचय syllables came to be considered as being uttered in उत्क्षिप्ताविशिष्ट उदात्तश्रुति. It is quite plausible that this kind of tonic distinction between उदात्त and प्रचय was made by the vedic chanters in India even in the very earliest times.

As I have already shown, modern practice also strictly conforms to the theory put forward in the Taittirīya Prātiśākhya according to which प्रचय (being the Keynote—ध्रुव) is easily distinguishable from *udātta*.

Thus it is seen that a definite concept of keynote is met with in the history of Indian Music, as early as the composition of the Taittirīya Prātiśākhya.

ADDENDA

I. We have seen that in the XVIIIth Chapter of the *Taittirīya Prātiśākhya, there is the citation of the opinions of various authorities as to the mode of utterance of the sacred syllable Om.*

In that connection, it is interesting to remember that Maurice Bloomfield (JAOS, Vol. 14, Proceedings 1889, Pages cli—clii) regards *Om* as *O* with nasalised utterance of the last vowel due to *pluti*. Pāṇini 8, 2, 67 (ओमभ्यादाने) says that the word was pronounced with *pluti* at the beginning (of books, chapters); to this long drawn utterance may be ascribed the nasal, which afterwards was felt as an organic part of the word, and treated as an independent *m*. M. Bloomfied (l.c.) identifies the word with *au* (*au—Ti, au—tis, au—this*, Latin *au—t, au—tem*, Gothic *au—k*, and others): the meaning would be something like 'now then, well now,' German '*abso*; *nun also*'. Scholars like Hick (Bezzenberger's Beitrage, Vol. VII Inschrift Von Larisa in Thessalien, p. 279) and Osthoff (Morph. Unt. IV, 253; zur geschichte des Perpectums p. 328) regard *ai au* as the *tonic* from corresponding to the particle *u* in *panu*. M. Bloomfield (*op. cit.*) thinks that *u*, the common vedic enclitic particle, holds the same relation to *om* as *u* to *au*. This scholar attaches absolutely no significance to the fact that *u* is always written *ūm* by the padapāṭhas, Ṛv., Av., Vs. and regards it as a curious coincidence. The pada text of

Ṛv. VII, 63, 2 reads *ut* | *ūm iti* | *eti* | while the krama text reads *udveti*. Again the pada text of Ṛv, I. 50, | reads *ut* | *ūm iti* | *tyam* | *jāta-vedasam* while the krama text reads *udu tyam ūm ityum* | *tyam jāta-vedasam* | Cp. also Ṛv. I, 61, 5; 6; 7; 8; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15.

Also *nū* ३ *ṣu*=*nū* | *um iti su* (Ṛv. I, 53, 1.

[*Cf.* Dyā Dviveda's comments on this:

इकारयोश्च प्रश्लेषे क्षैप्रातिक्षैप्रसन्धित्वात् (Ṛk Prāt. III, 13.)

स्वरितं कृत्वा 'जात्योऽभिनिहितः' (Ṛk Prāt. III, 3..)

इति कम्पः। उकारो मजस्य सुषा इति उकारस्य दीर्घत्वबहुक्षरेणेति (Ṛk Prāt. V, 5.)

षत्वम् *Vide.*

"Nītimañjarī" ed. by Sitaram Jayaram Joshi, Benares Hindu University, p. 36.]

(It is to be remarked in this connection that the enclitic *u* like the enclitic particles *ca* and *vā* certainly goes back to the primitive Indo-Germanic period. Compare, Brugmann: Grundris: English Translation, Vol. I, Sec. 672, p. 538).

[Cp. ईदूदेद्द्विवचनं प्रगृह्यम् (P. I, 1, 11.)

संबुद्धौ शाकल्यस्येतावनार्षे (P. I, 1, 16.)

उञः (P. I, 1, 17)

ऊँ (17. P. I, 1, 18.)

"According to Śākalya, ऊँ is substituted for उञ् (*i.e.* the particle उ) before an इति that does not come from Ṛṣi. This ऊँ is termed pragṛhya."

This like the last rule is verifiable in the Padapāṭha of the Ṛv. and Av., where the particle उ is replaced by ऊँ इति. Sv. and Ts. Pp., treat this matter differently, and Vs. Pp. has ऊँ इति ऊँ. The more reason we have to insist on iti, that Pāṇini quotes Śākalya as the author particularly of the Ṛv. See Pāṇini and the veda studies in the Early History of Linguistic Science in India by Dr. Paul Thieme Allahabad 1935, p. 5.]

But M. Bloomfield believes that the assumption that the separate, non-syntactic, emphatic of such a word is *o* would

naturally lead to a nasalized utterance is duly supported. Cp. also Whitney, Skr. Gram. 278*a*. [Cp. Bezzenberger's Beitrage Vol. 15, p. 296 for *pluta*. See also for the marking of accent in the Sāma Veda with regard to the word *Om*, Wäckernagel, Altindische Grammatik, Goltingen (1896) Vol. I, p. 286. "In the Sāma Veda, the sacred syllable *O३m* has only two lines the number 1 (*udātta*) before the deep-toned syllable, instead of following the general rule of having number 2 (*svarita*.)]

II. Whitney assumes from the word आक्षिप्त in the sūtra आक्षिप्तं स्वरितं (Av. Prāt. I, 16 JAOS, Vol. 7, p. 349.) that the concept of tonic was known from very ancient times. However European scholars have been misled sometimes by the exaggerated emphasis they lay on the fact that स्वरित is a melodic trill or cadence.

A telling instance to illustrate my point is the following: In Chāndogya Upaniṣad (I, 13, 2) we meet with the statement प्राणः स्वरः (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit series, p. 76).

Śaṅkara's gloss is as follows on this:

स्वर इति स्तोभः प्राणस्य च स्वरहेतुत्वसामान्यात्

Svara is not mentioned in Stobha List. (Bibliotheca Indica. Vol. II, p. 519—542, ed. by Satyavrata Samaśram.) From this fact and from the known fact that *svarita* is the trill or melodic cadence, Prof. B. Faddegon (Acta Orientalia Vol. V Ritualistic Dādaism, pp. 189—195) Amsterdam, equates *svara* in the passage with *svarita* and characterizes Śaṅkara's commentary to be untrustworthy. Faddegon is clearly wrong and I reproduce below the correct interpretation of the statement स्वरः इति स्तोभः as given by my revered Professor Mahāmahopādhyāya S. Kuppuswami Śāstrigal:—"Śaṅkara's statement स्वर इति स्तोभः has to be interpreted in the light of the tradition, which is preserved even in an age much later than Śaṅkara in Sāyaṇa's observation in the course of the latter's explanation of the Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa text—'स्वारं भवति' (*7, 3, 25, p. 237*, Kasi Sanskrit Series *No. 105*). Sāyaṇa says:—

'अत्र (औशनसाम्नि) अन्त्यमक्षरं स्वरयित्वा समापितं हाईकारश्च ।
इयमपि रूढ्या स्वर इति व्यपदिश्यते ।
अत्र हाईकारप्रसङ्गादुत्कार्षनिश्चयः ।'

It is clear from this that, when Śaṅkara says स्तोमः' he should be understood to refer to the *dādaism* 'हाई' which bears the technical name 'स्वर' and he should not be understood as referring to the sound-group 'स्वरः' as a *dādaism*. Sāyaṇa clearly says that the last syllable of the chant in question and the *dādaism* 'हाई' are both of them characterized by स्वरित and that both of them bear the technical name स्वर. The particular meditation (*upāsanā*) which is taught in the Chāndogya text 'प्राणः स्वरः,' as explained by Śaṅkara, is that the *dādaism* 'हाई' in its special phase of being denoted by the technical name स्वर should be meditated upon as *prāṇa*. Professor Faddegon's criticism, therefore, that Śaṅkara is making a technical mistake and that he is untrustworthy in technical matters, must be characterized as a rash and ill-informed indignity offered to one of the greatest masters of vedic tradition. In fact, Professor Faddegon's remarks betray a confusion between the technical name 'स्वर' and the term 'स्वर' in the sense of (musical cadence) or 'accent.' It may also be noted by the way that the meditation taught in the previous text ' requires the use of the *dādaism* 'हाई' as symbol (प्रतीक), in its specific form as a sound-group consisting of 'हा' and 'ई'; and that the meditation taught in the text 'प्राणः स्वरः' requires the use of the *dādaism* 'हाई' as symbol (प्रतीक), in its particular form as denoted by the technical name 'स्वर', and not as consisting of 'हा' and 'ई' "

DATE OF THE PRĀYAŚCITTA-CANDRIKĀ OF VIŚVANĀTHABHAṬṬA, SON OF NARASIṀHA DĪKṢITA—BEFORE A.D. 1543.

BY

P. K. GODE, M.A.,

Curator, B. O. R. Institute, Poona.

Prof. P. V. Kane makes the following remarks about a work on dharmaśāstra called the *Prāyaścitta-Candrikā*:—

"प्रायश्चित्तचन्द्रिका by विश्वनाथभट्ट ; mentioned by दिवाकर in his प्रायश्चित्तचन्द्रिका and in स्मार्तप्रायश्चित्तोद्धार ॥"[1]

As Prof. Kane assigns Divākara (Kāla) to the priod A.D. 1620 to 1670, we may assign Viśvanāthabhaṭṭa, the author of the *Prāyaścitta-Candrikā* to a date earlier than A.D. 1600.

Aufrecht[2] makes the following entries regarding the *Śrautaprāyaścitta-Candrikā* (same as *Prāyaścitta-Candrikā* mentioned by Prof. Kane) :—

"श्रौतप्रायश्चित्तचन्द्रिका—

Baudh. by Viśvanātha Bhaṭṭa, son of Narasiṁha Dīkṣita.

---

1. *History of Dharmaśāstra* (=*HD*) Vol. I (1930), p. 591.

P. 591.—" प्रायश्चित्तचन्द्रिका by दिवाकर son of महादेव, son of रामेश्वर Surnamed काल ".

P. 594.—" प्रायश्चित्तोद्धार by दिवाकर son of महादेव Surnamed काल. Also called स्मार्तप्रायश्चित्त and स्मार्तनिष्कृतिपद्धति (*vide* Baroda O.I. 133, 1543, 1663)".

P. 703.—" दिवाकर, son of महादेव, son of रामेश्वर Surnamed काल (काले in Marathi). He was daughter's son of रामकृष्णभट्ट father of कमलाकर, *About 1620—1670 A.D.*, Author of दानचन्द्रिका (or दानसंक्षेपचन्द्रिका) आह्निकचन्द्रिका, कालनिर्णयचन्द्रिका, स्मार्तप्रायश्चित्तोद्धार, पतितत्यागविधि, पुनरुपनयनप्रयोग."

2. *CCI*, *677*; CC II, 161.

IO. 1572,[1] L. 165, K. 188, B. 3, 108.[2]

Ben. 8, NW. 18, Sūcīpatra 36—"Stein 21."[3]

As the Jammu MS of the *Prāyaścitta-Candrikā* is dated Saṁvat 1656 or A.D. 1600, the date of composition of the work is evidently much earlier than A.D. 1600 but we have no means of determining the earlier limit exactly.

In the *Catalogue*[4] *of the Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Punjab University,* however, there is a dated MS of the *Prāyaścitta-Candrikā* which appears to me to be the oldest dated MS of this work. It is dated *Saṁvat 1599*=A.D. 1543[5] as will be seen from the following Colophon[6] appearing on its last folio:—

"इति श्रीनृसिंहदीक्षित सूनु विश्वनाथ विरचिता श्रौत प्रायश्चित्त-चन्द्रिका समाप्ता ॥ संवत् १५९९ समये पौषवदि १३ चन्द्रकहृ पुस्तक लिषा ॥ श्रीविश्वनाथाय नमः ॥ शुभमस्तु ॥"

If the above date is correct, we are in a position to push back the date of the *Prāyaścitta-Candrikā* before A.D. 1540, if not earlier.

The chronological data recorded above may now be tabulated as follows:—

---

1. *Vide* p. 91 of Part I of *IO Sanskrit MSS Cata.* (1887) MS No. 15726—"written, in Devanāgarī, in the *latter part of the 17th Century.*"

2. *Vide* p. 108 of Buhler's Fascicle. III of Cata. of MSS in Private Libraries (1872). The MS No. 239 of प्रायश्चित्तचन्द्रिका of विश्वनाथभट्ट is dated 1756 (Saṁvat) = A.D. 1700.

3. *Vide* p. 21 of Stein's *Cata of Jammu MSS* (1894), MS No. 2556 of श्रौतप्रायश्चित्तचन्द्रिका is dated Saṁavt 1556=(A. D. 1600.)

4. Vol. I (1932), *Page 55*—[" 452 प्रायश्चित्तचन्द्रिका (बौधायन) by विश्वनाथ, नृसिंहदीक्षितपुत्र, 50 leaves, 1000 Granthas—" सं 1599 "]

5. The date corresponds to *Wednesday, 3rd January* 1543 (*vide* p. 288 of *Indian Ephemeris,* Vol. V).

6. I am thankful to the Librarian, Punjab University Library, Lahore, for his kindness in sending me a copy of this Colophon.

A.D.	Reference.
1543	Date of Punjab University MS of the *Prāyaścitta-Candrikā* (=*PC*).
1600	Date of Jammu MS of the *PC*.
Between 1620 and 1670	Divākara mentions the *PC* in his *Prāyaścitta-Candrikā*.
C. 1650 —1700	Probable age of the India Office MS of the *PC*.
1700	Date of a MS of the *PC* mentioned by Buhler (Fascicle III).

On the strength of the above data, I am inclined to believe that the *PC* by Viśvanāthabhaṭṭa may have been composed before A.D. 1500 as we have the oldest dated MS of the work copied in Saṁvat 1599 or A.D. 1543.

THE DOCTRINE OF NIYOGA[1]

BY

PROF. M. HIRIYANNA

The conception of *dharma*[2] is as old as the Vedas; but it is difficult to say whether it was understood, in those early times, as a means to an end or as an end in itself. Judging from the literature that is now available to us, we may take it to have been generally[3] regarded then as a means to an end or as an instrumental value, the end being the attainment of some good in this life or in the next. This view has survived to the present day, but along with two important transformations of it. One of them looks upon *dharma* not as an instrumental, but as an intrinsic, value or as an end in itself. The other continues to believe in its instrumental character, but has altered the notion of the end it serves from worldly or other-worldly prosperity (*abhyudayā*) to moral betterment (*sattva-śuddhi*). Our object in this article is to explain the nature and the significance of the transformation involved in the second of these views; but it will be necessary, in doing so, to allude to the first for purposes of contrast.[4] We shall accordingly begin by giving a brief account of that view, which is held by more than one school of later Indian thought.

---

1. This article is based chiefly on the following works:

(*i*) *Prakaraṇa-pañcikā* of Śālikanātha, Chowkhamba Series (PP).

(*ii*) *Tantra-rahasya* of Rāmānujācārya, Gaekwad Oriental Series (TR).

(*iii*) *Vākyārtha-ratna* of Ahobalasūri, Mysore Oriental Library Series (VR).

2. It is as a moral and ritualistic conception that we are here concerned with *dharma*. The term, however, occasionally has other meanings also in Vedic literature. *Cf.* Kaṭha Upaniṣad i. 21, where it stands for 'entity' (*vastu*).

3. *E.g.* Īśa Upaniṣad verse 2, may be taken to teach *dharma* as an end in itself.

4. In both the views, with which we shall deal, there are divergences in matters of detail (*see e.g.*, TR. ch. iv). It is not possible to take them all into account in an article like this. We shall therefore confine our attention to the best known among them.

I

By *dharma* in this view, we have to understand *karma* or voluntary acts like sacrifices that are conducive to some good.[1] These acts, broadly speaking, are of two types: those that are *kāmya* or 'optional' and those that are *nitya* or 'obligatory'. It is clear that a similar distinction can be made in ordinary or secular activities also; and we shall use them as illustrations, though they may not be *dharma* in the strict sense of the term.

(1) *Kāmya-karma*: To start with a simple example from ordinary activities. Let us think of a doctor prescribing some medicine to a sick person. The doctor's instruction 'Take this medicine'[2] leads to a certain activity whose carrying out by the patient secures (or is expected to secure) for him the desired end, *viz*., restoration of health. The direction is conveyed by the imperative 'Take'; but the desire for the end sought is external to it, being prior to the direction. Here the act of taking the medicine (*dhātvartha*) is the means (*karaṇa*) to the attainment of the result (*phala*): the agent (*kartā*) in the act is the person who is ill; and the doctor's prescription indicates the fitness of the means to the realisation of the desired end (*iṣṭa-sādhanatva*).

Similarly in the usually cited ritualistic example of the *jyotiṣṭoma*,[3] the sacrificial act or *yāga* is the means to the attainment of *svarga* or heavenly bliss;[4] the agent is one who is desirous of it and is otherwise qualified, according to the

---

1. यागादिरेव धर्मः Acts that lead to an evil result are, by contrast, termed *adharma*. The word *karma* is wider in its significance, and is applied to both *dharma* and *adharma*.

2. *Cf*. *Tarka-saṁgraha-dīpikā*: आरोग्यकामः भैषज्यपानं कुर्यात्.

3. ज्योतिष्टोमेन स्वर्गकामो यजेत.

4. The term *svarga*, which once meant 'heaven', has no geographical significance in the later systems generally. It is usually explained as meaning 'unalloyed and continuous' or ideal bliss, though it often implies that it is to be experienced elsewhere

यन्न दुःखेन संभिन्नं न च ग्रस्तमनन्तरम् ।
अभिलाषोपनीतं च तत्सुखं स्वःपदास्पदम् ॥

Cf. Śabara on Jaimini Sūtra, VI. i. 1.

scriptures, to offer that sacrifice;[1] and the imperative or, more strictly, the potential suffix[2] (*liṅ*) indicates the fitness of the means to the realisation of the desired end. But there is one important difference. In the previous example, the result that follows is directly traceable to the taking of the medicine; but here it is obvious that no such direct relation can exist between the act and the result, for one has to wait for the fruit of the sacrificial act performed in this life till after death. To bridge the intervening gulf between them is postulated an *apūrva* or some unseen power or capacity which endures in the agent until the result is attained.[3] This mediated causation of the desired end is a distinguishing feature of ritualistic activity, as compared with secular commands like that considered above. The *apūrva* here is described as a *kalpya* ('postulated'), which means that it is not expressly mentioned in the Vedic injunction but is only deduced from it.

(2) *Nitya-karma*: In both the above instances, it is the end that determines the activity. But there are activities secular as well as ritualistic with which no such result is explicitly associated. 'Fetch that book',[4] said by a teacher to his pupil (say), may be taken as an instance of the former type. 'One ought to worship the goddess of *saṁdhyā* every day'[5] may be given as an instance of activities which are similar in the sphere of ritual, for no end is mentioned in the scripture in their case as in that of optional deeds. But these commands also are followed by appropriate activities. So the question arises as to whether they serve any end or not. In accordance with the general principle admitted in this view, *viz.*, that no voluntary activity is conceivable in the absence of an idea of a

---

1. The result is taken to follow necessarily, provided the rules of the sacrifice have all been carefully observed. The certainty of the result here distinguishes this activity from that in the above example.

2. For the sake of uniformity, we shall generally speak of the imperative suffix.

3. There are rites which yield their fruit in the present life; but, even in their case, an *apūrva* is assumed.

4. Strictly, this would be an instance of ***naimittika-karma*** and not of ***nitya-karma***. But the distinction is of no importance in regard to the point under consideration here.

5. अहरहस्संध्यामुपासीत

suitable end, it is laid down that here also an end is intended, though it is not expressly stated. Ordinarily, that end is explained as the avoidance of some unwelcome result (*pratyavāya-parihāra*), which would follow if the behests were neglected. Thus *all* voluntary activity, according to this view, is prompted by the desire for an end.[1] The only distinction is that in activities of the first or *kāmya* type, the end is positive, while in those of the second or *nitya* type it is negative.

II

The view that we propose to consider specifically in this article is that of the Prābhākara school of Mīmāṁsā.[2] In dealing with the present topic, the writers of that school begin with a discussion of optional deeds (*kāmya-karmas*) and then extend the conclusion reached in their case to that of obligatory deeds (*nitya-karmas*).[3] It will be better for our purpose here to reverse this order, and to take up the latter for first consideration. The previous view, as we have just stated, associates an end with obligatory deeds also, though there is no reference to it in the scriptural texts prescribing them. The Prābhākara school criticises it for doing so. The commands for which such *karmas* stand, it maintains, are meant to be carried out for their own sake and not for any end. Thus the mandate or *niyoga*, which is the meaning of the imperative suffix, becomes all important; and it is because this *niyoga* is identified with *dharma* that we described the latter as an intrinsic value according to this school. The *niyoga* or *dharma* is also named *kārya* ('duty'), inasmuch as the person commanded sets about accomplishing it under a sense of obligation (*mamedam kāryam iti*).

It is not merely that there is no scriptural warrant to associate any end with such deeds; to judge from the form of the injunction, there is no logical need either, it is added, for doing so. The only two elements necessary to make a mandate significant are (1) the person (or class of persons) to whom it

---

1. इष्टसाधनताज्ञानं प्रवर्तकम्.

2. The view of Kumārila differs from both this view and the previous one, but it is more like the latter than the former.

3. See *e.g.*, PP. p. 192.

is addressed (*niyojya*)[1] and (2) its content (*viṣaya*).[2] That is, a mandate should indicate who is to obey it, and what particular act he should do to obey it. In the illustrative example of this type of *karma*, cited above from the scriptures, those who are to obey the behest are the three higher castes, and its content is the worshipping (*upa+ās*) of the goddess of *saṁdhyā*. When these two are known (the latter, with the necessary details), the mandate becomes fully intelligible and nothing else remains to be known. The application of this principle of interpretation to the corresponding secular activity instanced above, *viz.*, 'Fetch that book' is clear. It is the pupil that is to obey, and he fulfils the command when he takes the book to the teacher. There is as little need to think of any end that the *niyojya* seeks in the one case as in the other.

These are not, however, the only types of *karma* taught in the Veda or are known to us in everyday life for there are, as we know, optional deeds also. Let us now consider the Vedic injunction about one of them, *viz.*, the *jyotiṣṭoma* sacrifice. Here there is a potential form (*yajeta*) which signifies a behest. But what is it that is to be accomplished (*sādhya*)? According to the previous view, it is *svarga*. But Prabhākara contends that there is nothing in the form of the verb itself to connect it with that end. This form (*yajeta*) consists of a root and a suffix. While the suffix connotes the command, the root, as in the previous example, points to the sacrifice as the content of that command. It is this command or *niyoga*, he says, that is principally to be carried out here also. But a mandate, as we have seen, needs not only a content to become significant, but also the *niyojya* to whom it is addressed; and it is to supply this need that the other expression, *viz.*, *svarga-kāma* is used in the injunction. These two needs being supplied, the mandate becomes fully intelligible, and requires no further supplementation.

But the expression *svarga-kāma*, which defines the person addressed, involves a reference to an end, for it means 'he who seeks *svarga*'. The end, *as such*, may not be needed for the mandate to become significant; but it happens here to be

---

1. The *niyojya* is defined as follows:

नियोज्यस्स तु कार्ये यस्स्वकीयत्वेन बुध्यते (PP. p. 182).

2. Strictly, it is the content of the will (*kṛti*) to carry out the *niyoga*. See VR. iii. st. 15-7.

included in the description of the *niyojya*[1] and cannot therefore be dismissed as irrelevant to the injunction. It may not be required for making the mandate intelligible; but the idea of the *niyojya* will be incomplete without it. What then is the status of the *phala* here? The answer is that it is a *consequence* of the *niyoga* which is to be accomplished. That is to say, when the mandate is carried out, the end ensues as a matter of course.[2] But the *niyoga* or *dharma* is not therefore to be regarded as its means or operative cause (*karaṇa*); it is only a necessary antecedent to it. Its operative cause is the sacrifice,[3] as in the other view, so that the *yāga* becomes the content of the command as well as the means to the *phala*. But the latter is only a secondary function it discharges, for unless the mandate is first accomplished through it, the *svarga* will not ensue. Further, this aspect of the *yāga*, *viz.*, its serving as the means to *svarga* is not included in the injunction (*aśābda*), but is in the nature of a corollary (*aupādānika*) to it.[4] The result of describing *svarga* as a mere consequent, and not as the end directly aimed at, is that the *niyoga* occupies the foremost place in the injunctive situation here also as it does in obligatory deeds.[5] Thus we see that the Prābhākara school tries to assign the same central position to the *niyoga* in activities of both the types we are considering.

There is one other point to consider, *viz.*, the exact nature of the *kārya* here or the meaning of the imperative suffix. In the case of the secular activity mentioned above, the doctor's direction is carried out by taking the medicine. It is this act (*kriyā*) that, according to the present view, is the *kārya* there,

---

1. It is consequently described here as नियोज्यविशेषण.

Cf. PP. न हि फलं फलतयान्वीयते, किं त्वधिकारिविशेषणतया (p. 191).

2. फलसिद्धिस्तु नान्तरीयका (TR. p. 66).

3. VR. iii. st. 51-7.

4. VR. iii. st. 18. The word *jyotiṣṭomena*, with its instrumental suffix, occurring in the injunction, may suggest that this aspect also is expressly mentioned in it. But it is explained as appositional in character, and as meant to *specify* the sacrifice referred to in *yajeta*. See VR. iv. st. 74.

5. *Cf.* PP. आत्मसिद्ध्यनुकूलस्य नियोज्यस्य प्रसिद्धये ।
कुर्वत्स्वर्गादिकमपि प्रधानं कार्यमेव नः ॥ (p. 190).

and the result (*phala*) follows directly from it. But in the case of the sacrifice, the result is to accrue only in a future life, which necessar ly entails a break between the action and its fruit. There is consequently a need for something to link them together; and it is the accomplishment of the latter that is signified by the suffix here. Hence we must give up the idea that it is the mere *act* that is always the *kārya* ('duty'), as we have hitherto implied, and assume in its stead an enduring something (*sthāyyeva kiṁcit*), which results from the sacrificial act and serves as the antecedent of the result.[1] It is this additional element and not, as in the previous view, the mere act that is meant by the term *dharma*. It is also called *apūrva* (which literally means 'never before'), because it cannot be known except through the scriptures.[2] While in secular mandates, the imperative suffix thus stands for *kriyā-kārya* ('act-duty'), in Vedic mandates it does for *apūrva-kārya* ('*apūrva*-*duty*'). Both forms of *kārya* are the same, for both alike prompt activity.[3] The only distinction is that while the first is knowable empirically, the second is not. In other words, the conception of *dharma* is unique,[4] and so is the source of our knowledge of it.

But, if the potential ending or *liṅ*, as it is technically called, connotes what is unique and is altogether beyond our experience, it may be asked how we are able to know it. We interpret Vedic statements with our knowledge of the meanings of words we commonly use.[5] If the *liṅ* here means something wholly unknown to us, it amounts to saying that we cannot at all understand the Vedic injunctions containing words with this suffix. This objection is met by pointing out that not *all* the words in a sentence need to be previously known for understanding it. It will suffice if we know the majority of them. The sense of the remaining one or two words, we can generally

---

1. VR. i. st. 53-4

2. *Cf*. PP. क्रियादिभिन्नं यत्कार्यं वेद्यं मानान्तरैर्न तत् ।
अतो मानान्तरापूर्वमपूर्वमिति गीयते ॥ (p. 187).

3. कार्यताज्ञानं प्रवर्तकम्. See PP. p. 180. Contrast Note 14.

4. See PP. p. 192.

5. *Cf*. what is known as *loka-veda-nyāya* (Jaimini Sūtra, I. iii. 8-9, 30-5).

gather with the aid of those whose meanings we already know. It is thus that the meaning of the *liṅ* suffix has been ascertained to be *apūrva* in the sense explained. In the example we have selected, it is the expression *svarga-kāma* occurring in the sentence that leads, as already indicated, to this conclusion, *viz.*, that the suffix cannot refer to the sacrificial act as the 'duty' to be done, because it is transient, but to something else which is accomplished by that act. That is the primary meaning (*vācyārtha*) of *liṅ*, because it is used in that sense in the Veda. The *apūrva* is accordingly described here as *vācyāpūrva* and, though bearing the same name, is distinguished from the *kalpyāpūrva* of the rival view. The suffix, no doubt, means the mere act as 'duty' (*kriyā-kārya*) in secular statements, but that is only its secondary sense (*lakṣyārtha*).[1] In other words, there is not, in the case of secular duties, the same kind of obligation as in that of the Vedic injunction. If we still speak of them as 'duties', it is only by courtesy that we do so. They have a utilitarian basis or presuppose some kind of explicit or implicit convention.[2]

III

We may now summarise the differences between the two views, and conclude by making one or two general observations on them. To begin with optional deeds. In the injunction about the *jyotiṣṭoma* sacrifice, the expression *svarga-kāma* represents, according to the first view, the agent in the act of sacrificing. The root in *yajeta*, the second word, denotes the rite as the means to *svarga* which is to be achieved; and the suffix signifies the fact that it brings about a good. It is this *yāga* that is *dharma* here, and it leads to *svarga* not directly but through what is described as *kalpyāpūrva*. According to the

1. PP. p. 196. Here we find the probable reason why, as above noted, the works of the Prābhākara school, in discussing this topic, begin with optional deeds. It is to explain the primary sense of *liṅ* first.

2. *Cf.* Śabara on Jaimini Sūtra, I. iii. 2. Here naturally arises the question whether moral duties are to be reckoned as *dharma* or not. The answer to this question depends upon what we exactly mean by 'moral duties'. Generally speaking, they fall, according to the orthodox view, under *dharma* since 'scripture' (*śāstra*), in its wider sense, comprehends Smṛtis and *śiṣṭācāra* which, together with the Veda, treat fully of morality.

second view, on the other hand, the first expression defines the *niyojya*. The suffix in *yajeta* points to the mandate ; and the root in it, to its content. It is this mandate or *apūrva*, which is to be carried out, that is *dharma* here and not the *yāga* as in the previous view. Owing to the characterisation of the *niyojya* as *svarga-kāma*, the injunction involves a reference to *svarga* also ; but this *phala*, which necessarily presupposes the accomplished *niyoga*, is explained as its consequence and therefore as not affecting its primacy. If we overlook for the moment the divergence in the meaning of *apūrva* in the two views, we may say that both recognise *apūrva* and *phala*, but that the emphasis they lay on them is quite different. More or less the same contrast is found between the two views in regard to obligatory deeds also ; only while the one recognises an end (*phala*) in their case too, the other refuses to associate it with them in any sense.

We have stated that the end sought in all voluntary activity, according to the first view, is either pleasure or the avoidance of pain ; and this may make the doctrine appear fundamentally hedonistic. Without entering into the details of this complicated question, we may state briefly that the objection does not stand for, though pleasure or happiness is represented as the aim of all voluntary activity, the pursuit of certain pleasure is condemned in unequivocal terms. Or, as we might put it otherwise, it is *śreyas* alone that is commended and not *preyas*.[1] The same conclusion follows also from the recognition here of 'prohibited deeds' (*pratiṣiddha-karma*), which include acts like inflicting injury on living beings (*hiṁsā*), in addition to the two already mentioned, *viz*., optional and obligatory deeds. The criterion of dharma is not thus pleasure or happiness, but that which distinguishes between worthy and unworthy pleasures. As the majority of those who hold the present view, we may add, believe that unaided human reason cannot discover this distinction, they rest for a knowledge of it on scriptural teaching or revelation.

Unlike the above, the school of Prabhākara holds that, in judging the worth of activities coming under *dharma*, the ele-

1. *Cf*. Śabara on Jaimini Sūtra, I. i. 2:
य एव श्रेयस्करस्स एव धर्मशब्देनोच्यते......यः पुरुषं निश्श्रेयसेन संयुनक्ति स एव धर्मशब्देनोच्यते.

ment of natural inclination should be subordinated, if it cannot be wholly dismissed. The charge of hedonism cannot therefore be brought against it. But there may be another objection. Whatever view we may take of the place it assigns to pleasure or happiness in the case of optional deeds, the school recognises an unconditional imperative in the case of obligatory deeds. Does not this make the conception of 'duty' here quite barren ? Or, to state the same in a different way, what is the penalty, if one should disobey the mandates prescribing such duties? This question is discussed in the works of the school, and we shall state the answer in the words of one of them.[1]

'The personal ending such as that of the potential mood (*liṅādi*), you say, teaches *apūrva* as a duty to be accomplished. In that case one may not set about it, although it is known as a duty, because it serves no end '.

'Even in respect of optional deeds, which are known to have an end, one may not act. What is to be done? The function of *pramāṇas* ceases with the mere revealing of facts'.

'Well, in the case of the optional deeds, the failure to perform them means missing their fruit, and that is the penalty. What is the penalty in the case of unconditional duties?'

'The Vedic mandate will not then have been carried out'.

'What of that?'

'That itself is the punishment, for that itself is of ultimate value (*puruṣārtha*). It is on the analogy of these *karmas* that we say that carrying out the mandate is the true end even in the case of optional deeds, and that the attainment of the so-called *phala* is merely what follows next'.

'How can their non-accomplishment be itself the punishment?'

'The good, who praise those that obey the Vedic behest and blame those that do not, will answer that question. Or perhaps one's own conscience, which feels guilty of having proved faithless to it, will do so'.

The appeal in this discussion, it will be seen, is first to the judgment of the better mind of the community, and then to

---

1. TR. p. 66. The following translation is reproduced here, with one or two minor alterations, from the writer's *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*, p. 331. *Cf.* PP. p. 191.

the verdict of one's own conscience. Here we have a conception of duty for duty's sake[1] and that, in a sense far more rigorous than in the Gītā, since even motives so pure as 'cleansing the heart' (*sattva-śuddhi*) and 'pleasing God' (*Īśvara-prīti*) are excluded. The doing of duty is thus placed in this view on a basis of *absolute* disinterestedness.

1. TR. describes *apūrva* as स्वयंप्रयोजनभूत (p. 70).

VEDIC STUDIES : III. THE ROOT *ŚVAS, ŚUṢ*

BY

DR. A. VENKATASUBBIAH

(Continued from Vol. XIV, page 294).

(3) 1, 140, 5: ād asya te dhvasayanto vṛtherate
kṛṣṇam abhvaṃ mahi varpaḥ karikrataḥ |
yat sīṃ mahīm avanīṃ prābhi marmṛśad
abhiśvasan stanayann eti nānadat ||

"Then those (flames) of this (Agni) move swiftly forward destroying the black being and putting on great splendour when he goes caressing the wide earth, roaring, thundering, resounding". See VVSt. 1, 204. Compare also 1, 65, 8; 10, 45, 4; 1, 94, 10; 1, 58, 2 and 4, which have all been cited above and which, like this verse, describe the forest-fire.

(4) 5, 29, 4: ād rodasī vitaraṃ vi ṣkabhāyat
saṃvivyānaś cid bhiyase mṛgaṃ kaḥ |
jigartim indro apajargurāṇaḥ
prati śvasantam ava dānavaṃ han ||

"He then established firmly earth and heaven wide apart, even when wearing (them); he frightened the monster; spurning the swallower, Indra, opposing, smote the demon who was roaring".

Jigartim, in pāda a, is a hap. leg., and I have followed Sāyaṇa (girantam ācchādayantam), Roth (Pw), Grassmann and Ludwig in deriving it from the root *gar* or *gir* 'to swallow' and interpreting it as above. It is possible however that it may be a derivative of *gar* or *gir* 'to invoke' and signify 'crying loudly'. Or, is it a proper name and denotes a demon like the name *suṣṇa ?*

apajargurāṇaḥ, in the same pāda, has been explained differently as *ācchādanād vimocayan* (Sāyaṇa), 'making him

disgorge what had been swallowed' (Ludwig), 'swallowing' (Grassmann, *ṚV. Über.*), and 'threatening, spurning' (Roth) by the above-mentioned interpreters. The first three derive it from the root *gar* or *gir* 'to swallow', while Roth regards it as a derivative of the root *gur* (gurī udyamane). In the above translation, I have followed the view of Roth; compare the use of *apagūrya* in 5, 32, 6:

> *tyaṃ cid ittha katpayaṃ śayānam asūrye*
> *tamasi vāvṛdhānam|*
> *taṃ cin mandāno vṛṣabhaḥ sutasyoccair*
> *indro apagūryā jaghāna.*

It is the opinion of the above-named interpreters that *mṛgam*, in pāda b, like *dānavam* in d, refers to the demon Vṛtra who is referred to as *ahi* in the preceding verse: *tad dhi havyaṃ manuṣe gā avindad ahann ahiṁ papivān indro asya.*

In connection with pādas ab and Indra's 'wearing' of heaven and earth, compare 1, 173, 6: *saṃ vivya indro vṛjanaṃ na bhūmā bharti svadhavān opaśam iva dyām* "Indra wore the earth as (also) the middle world, the mighty one wears the sky as a head-ornament". Compare also 2, 17, 2: *śūro yo yutsu tanvaṃ parivyata śīrṣaṇi dyām mahinā praty amuñcata* 'the hero (Indra), who in battles, covered his body and, by his greatness, wore the heaven (as an ornament) on his head'; and 8, 14, 5: *yajña indram avardhaya yad bhūmiṃ vy avartayat cakrāṇa opaśaṃ divi* 'the sacrifice strengthened Indra so that he unrolled the earth and made a head-ornament of the sky'.

(5) 8, 21, 11: tvayā ha svid yujā vayaṃ
prati śvasantaṃ vṛṣabha bruvīmahi |
saṃsthe janasya gomataḥ ||

"O thou strong one, may we, with thee as companion, reply to the roaring one, in the encounter with people possessing cows".

Pratibruvīmahi 'may we reply'='may we overcome', as explained by Sāyaṇa (*nirākariṣyāmaḥ*). *saṃsthe janasya gomataḥ* seems to be a periphrasis for *gosātau* 'battle for cows'; *śvasantam=garjantam*, 'one who talks loudly'.

(6) 10, 94, 6: ugrā iva pravahantaḥ samāyamuḥ
sākaṃ yuktā vṛṣaṇo bibhrato dhuraḥ |
yac chvasanto jagrasānā arāviṣuḥ
śṛṇva eṣāṃ prothatho arvatām iva ||

"Like strong horses drawing (a chariot, they have exerted themselves; yoked together, the strong ones carry the poles. When they swallow (*i.e.*, pound on the Soma shoots), making a loud sound, roaring, the sound made by them is heard like the neighing of horses".

This verse is addressed to the *grāvāṇaḥ*, the stones that press the juice from the stalks of the Soma plant. It is the opinion of the RV poets that the sound made by these pressing stones is very lou..; and the author of hymn 10,94 in which this verse occurs has said of them in vv. 4, 12 that they 'make the earth resound' (*āghoṣayantaḥ pṛthivīm upabdibhiḥ*) and that they 'have rent heaven and earth with their roar' (*ā dyāṃ ravena pṛthivīm aśuśravuḥ*). Compare also the expressions *ślokaṃ ghoṣaṃ bharatha, abhi krandanti, arāviṣuḥ* and *krośanti* used of them in vv. 1-4 of the same hymn, and likewise 5, 36, 4 explained below.

(7) 10, 48, 6: ahaṃ etān chāśvasato dvā-dve-
ndraṃ ye vajraṃ yudhaye 'kṛṇvata |
āhvayamānān ava hanmanāhanaṃ
dṛḷhā vadann anamasyur namasvinaḥ ||

dṛḷhā vadan, in pāda d, is an unusual combination of words and difficult to interpret. This expression occurs in 3, 30, 5 *utābhaye puruhūta śravobhir eko dṛḷhām avado vṛtrahā san*, which too is addressed to Indra. Sāyaṇa explains this half-verse as *uta ity āmantraṇe | he indra puruhūta purubhir bahubhir yajvabhir āhūta | yad vā devair asurebhyo rakṣārthaṃ bahuvāram āhūta | śravobhir vīryair upetaḥ ekaḥ asahāyas tvaṃ vṛtrahā vṛtra-śatror hantā san abhaye asurebhyaḥ sakāśān mā bibhīteti devān prati yad vākyam avadaḥ avocaḥ tad vākyaṃ dṛḍhaṃ satyam eva,* while Geldner, Grassmann and Ludwig translate it (*RV. Über.*) as "And, O thou that art much invoked, in fearlessness, thou hast, with renown, alone made a firm speech, as the killer of Vṛtra". "Then thou alone didst smite the solid fortress with might, without fear, as the killer

of Vṛtra, O thou that art much invoked". "And, in security, O thou that art much invoked, thou didst, through thy glorious deeds, speak alone, as the killer of Vṛtra, what is infallible", respectively in their *RV. Über.* Pāda d of 10, 48, 6, on the other hand, is rendered as 'with a powerful shout, I unbending, those that bent' by Grassmann, and as 'forcefully addressing, [I,] the not-prayer, those that prayed' by Ludwig, while Sāyaṇa has explained it as *namasvino namanavato balān nāmayitvā anamasyur apraṇati-śilas san dṛḷhā dṛḍhāni bhaya-janakāni sthirāṇi vacanāni vadan.*

I am inclined to believe that Grassmann's interpretation of 3, 30, 5 is on right lines, and I therefore translate 10, 48, 6 as:

"These persons, who, talking loudly, challenging, made Indra and the vajra fight, did I smite with my weapon, making them bend, [I,] Indra, unbending, and shouting loudly at the solid (fortresses)."

Regarding the expression *dṛḷhā vadan*, compare the sentence *gotrā gavām aṅgiraso gṛṇanti* 'the Aṅgirases sing at the mountains of the cows, that is, speak loudly at the mountain-fortresses imprisoning ths cows' in 6, 65, 5 (explained above) in which the poet continues with the words *vy arkeṇa bibhidur brahmaṇā ca* 'they have, by means of a spell, a magic formula, split them open'. The word *dṛḷhā* refers to the same mountain-fortresses or prisons; but there is, in 10, 48, 6, nothing to correspond to the sentence *vy arkeṇa bibhidur brahmaṇā ca.* The expression *dṛḷhā vadan* seems therefore to include the idea of 'breaking open' also; compare Grassmann's translation (cited above) of 3, 30, 5. The root *vad*, in *vadan*, does not signify 'to talk', but 'to make a loud sound', the sense which it has in the hymn 10, 94 addressed to the pressing stones.

(8) 1, 30, 16: śaśvad indraḥ popruthadbhir jigāya
nānadadbhiḥ śāśvasadbhir dhanāni ||
sa no hiraṇyarathaṃ daṃsanāvānt
sa naḥ sanitā sanaye sa no 'dāt ||

Compare also the expression *ṛkvabhir goṣu* 'singing towards the cows' in 6, 32, 3 (explained above) and *paṇīnr vacobhir abhi yodhad indraḥ* in 6, 39, 2 (explained above).

"Again and again has Indra won riches with the shouting, roaring, loudly-crying (Aṅgirases); the mighty one has given to us a chariot of gold as reward, be the rewarder to us, be to us."

There is no substantive in the verse in connection with the epithets *pópruthadbhiḥ, nā́nadadbhiḥ, śā́śvasadbhiḥ*; hence, Sāyaṇa, guided perhaps by the word *pópruthadbhiḥ*, supplies the word *aśvaiḥ* after them in his commentary, and has been followed by Grassmann, Ludwig and Geldner in their *ṚV. Über.*

But the root *pruth* is used in the RV in two passages only in connection with the horses, whereas it is used in five passages in connection with Agni (7, 3, 2: *próthad áśvo ná yávase 'viṣyán*), the Soma juice (10, 115, 3: *índuṃ próthantaṃ pravápantaṃ arṇavám*; 9, 98, 12: *apapróthantaḥ sanutár huraścítaḥ*), the war-drum (6, 47, 30: *ápa protha dundubhe ducchúnāitáḥ*), and the bull (10, 115, 2: *inó ná próthamāno yávase vṛṣā*, with the sense of 'making a loud sound'. Again, there is no other passage[1] in the RV in which Indra is described as winning riches (or anything else) with horses. And thirdly, one of the verses referred to by Geldner in his note on this verse, namely, 6, 32, 3 (this has been explained above): *sá váhnibhir ṛ́kvabhir góṣu śáśvan mitájñubhiḥ purukṛ́tvā jigāya | púraḥ purohā́ sákhibhiḥ sakhīyán dṛḷhā́ ruroja kavíbhiḥ kavíḥ sán* (note the occurrence of the words *jigāya* and *śaśvat* in this verse also) states that Indra, with the singing Aṅgirases, won cows again and again after shattering the solid fortresses. It hence seems to me preferable to supply a word like *aṅgirobhiḥ* (or *sakhibhiḥ*, etc.) after *śā́śvasadbhih*, and to translate the verse as above.

The Aṅgirases, as we have already seen (see above), sing or shout loudly a spell of truth when shattering the fortress that imprison the cows; and these mountains, it is said in 10, 108, 7:

---

[1] Verses like 6, 25, 2: *anāśúnā cid árvatā índro jétā hitáṃ dhánam* belong to a quite different category, and, naturally, do not enter into consideration in this connection.

ayaṃ nidhiḥ sarame adribudhno gobhir aśvebhir vasubhir nyṛṣṭaḥ ('this treasure at the bottom of the mountain, O Saramā, is embellished with cows, horses and wealth'), held not only cows, but also horses and wealth. Compare also what has been said above in connection with *draviṇa,* and *dhana.*

(9) 8, 93, 16: śrutaṃ vo vṛtrahantamaṃ
pra śardhaṃ carṣaṇīnāṃ |
ā śuṣe rādhase mahe ||

"I call loudly (Indra), renowned amongst you, valiant among all beings and best killer of enemies, for a great gift."

The vocative *praśardha* 'very valiant' occurs in 8, 4, 1:

yadindra prāg apāg udaṅ nyag vā hūyase nṛbhiḥ|
simā purū nṛṣūto asy ānave 'si praśardha turvaśe.

"When, O Indra, thou art called east, west, north or south by men, thou, impelled by men, stayest mostly with Ānava; O valiant one, thou stayest with Turvaśa," while, on the other hand, the particle *pra* is, in no other RV verse, used in combination with the verb *śuṣ*. It seems therefore probable that *pra śardham* in this verse is a corruption of *praśardham* (see Oldenberg, RV Noten, II,144). The meaning of *praśardhaṃ carṣaṇīnām* would be 'most valiant among beings.' Compare with this the expressions *samrājaṃ carṣaṇīnām* 'ruler of all beings' and *vṛṣabhaṃ carṣaṇīnām,* 'best of all beings' that are applied to Agni and Bṛhaspati respectively in 3, 10, 1: *tvām agne manīṣiṇaḥ samrājaṃ carṣaṇīnām | devaṃ martāsa indhate sam adhvare* and 3, 62, 6: *vṛṣabhaṃ carṣaṇīnāṃ viśvarūpam adābhyam | bṛhaspatiṃ vareṇyam.*

In connection with *ā śuṣe rādhase,* compare 1, 17, 7: *indrāvaruṇā vām ahaṃ huve citrāya rādhase* 'I call you, O Indra and Varuṇa, for a beautiful gift.' Compare also 8, 34, 4: *ā tvā kaṇvā ihāvase havante vājasātaye.* 'The Kaṇvas call thee now for aid and for the granting of wealth'; 8, 3, 5: *indraṃ samīke vanino havāmaha indraṃ dhanasya sātaye* 'Longingly we cry for Indra in battles, for the granting of wealth.'

(10) 1, 61, 10: asyedeva śavasā śuṣantam
vi vṛścad vajreṇa vṛtram indraḥ |
gā na vrāṇā avanīr amuñcad
abhi śravo dāvane sacetāḥ ||

"By his own strength, Indra cut the roaring Vrtra with the thunderbolt; he frees the rivers, like the cows, that had been confined, for fame, with a mind to give".

Regarding the roar of Vṛtra, compare 1, 52, 10: *dyauś cid asyāmavān aheḥ svanād ayoyavīd bhiyasā vajra indra te vṛtrasya yad badbadhānasya rodasī made sutasya śavasa 'bhinac chiraḥ.* "Even Heaven drew back in haste with fear from the shout of the *ahi,* when, O Indra, thy thunderbolt, in the intoxication of the pressed (Soma juice), cut off in an instant the head of Vṛtra who was oppressing the two worlds"; compare also 8, 96, 7 explained below :

(11) 1, 147, 1: kathā te agne śucayanta āyor
dadāśur vājebhir āśuṣāṇāḥ |
ubhe yat toke tanaye dadhānā
ṛtasya sāman raṇayanta devāḥ ||

"How, O Agni, did the glowing (sons of) Āyu, shouting with all their might, make offerings when the gods, conferring both sons and sons' sons, found delight in the song of *ṛta.*"

I follow Geldner (*RV. Über,*) in supplying the word 'sons' after *āyoḥ* in pāda a. *śucayantaḥ* 'glowing'=glowing with piety, fervour or *tapas* (see Geldner, *ibid.*); *āśuṣāṇāḥ* 'shouting'=singing your praises loudly. Regarding the expression *vājebhir āśuṣāṇāḥ,* see Pischel's footnote in Ved. St., 1, 11.

In pāda c, *tanaye* seems to be a neuter dual (neuter gender due to the association of *toke*) and the word *ubhe* to refer to *toke* and *tanaye* as it does in 8, 103, 7: *ubhe toke tanaye dasma viśpate parṣi rādho maghonām.* 'O thou mighty lord of the clans, thou givest to the liberal (sacrificers, our patrons) both sons and sons' sons and gifts'. In the alternative, it can be regarded as locative singular, in which case the meaning of pāda c would be 'when conferring on (their) son both kinds of

offspring (*i.e.*, sons and daughters)'. This is the view adopted by Geldner in his translation of the verse (*ibid.*); see however his note on p. 186.

(12) 2, 19, 7: evā ta indrocatham ahema
śravasyā na tmanā vājayantaḥ |
aśyāma tat sāptam āśuṣāṇā
nanāmo vadhar adevasya pīyoḥ ||

"Thus have we, with a desire for wealth, sent you this chant, O Indra, as those desirous of winning the prize (send horses). May we, crying out loudly, obtain the septenate; thou hast struck down (*i.e.*, turned away) the weapon of the godless reviler."

As object of *āśuṣāṇāḥ* must be understood the chant (*ucatha*) mentioned in pāda a. Regarding *sāptam*, it is difficult to say what the septenate of desired things is. According to Sāyaṇa, *sāptam* is the same as *sāptapadīnam* (*sakhyam*) or 'friendship'; and this view has been adopted by Ludwig and Geldner. Verses 5, 1, 5 and 6, 74, 1 mention *sapta ratnā* while 1, 20, 7 refers to *sāptāni ratnāni*; and, according to Skandasvāmin's commentary on 1, 20, 7, the seven jewels are either those mentioned in the verse

chatram ratho maṇir bhāryā nidhir aśvo gajas tathā |
etāni sapta ratnāni pūrveṣām cakravartinām||

or gold, silver, ruby, pearl, etc. Geldner also points out in his note (on p. 271) that the word *sāptam* (with accent on last syllable) occurs in v. 5 of hymn 8, 55 in which presents of seven kinds are mentioned.

It is the view of Roth (in the PW) and Grassmann that *sāpta* is derived from *sapti* and signifies 'prize' (*vāja*).

(13) 4, 24, 4: kratūyanti kṣitayo yoga ugrā-
śuṣāṇāso mitho arṇasātau |
saṃ yad viśo 'vavṛtranta yudhmā
ād in nema indrayante abhike ||

"O fierce one, the peoples shouting loudly at each other in the battle for water, are exerting themselves in the acquisition of wealth, while some clans, fighting, have acted like Vṛtra, others have acted like Indra in the encounter".

Āśuṣāṇāso mithaḥ is equivalent to ***nadantaḥ*** and ***prati-nadantaḥ*** in MBh. 6, 99, 18-20:

> *bherī-mṛdaṅga-paṇavān nādayantaś ca puṣkarān* |
> *Pāṇḍavā abhyavartanta nadanto bhairavān svarān* ||
> *bherī-mṛdaṅga-śaṅkhānāṃ dundubhīnāṃ ca nissvanaiḥ* |
> *utkruṣṭa-siṃhanādaiś ca valgitaiś ca pṛthagvidhaiḥ* ||
> *vayaṃ prati-nadantas tān agacchāma tvarānvitāḥ.* ||

Or should we supply *tvām* as object and interpret the expression as 'calling on thee loudly, (competing) against each other'? Compare the preceding verse *tam in naro vi hvayante samīke . . . tokasya tanayasya sātau* 'Men, competing, call on him alone in the battle for the winning of sons and sons' sons'. According to this interpretation, v. 4 would be a continuation of v. 3 and the two together signify that 'men, competing with each other, call loudly on Indra for aid in the battle for the winning of sons and in that for the winning of water'.

The word *avavṛtranta*, in c, is derived by Roth (in the PW) and Grassman (*Wort*) from the root *vṛt*. This is the view of Sāyaṇa who explains pādas cd as *yad yadā yudhmāḥ* | *yodhayitryaḥ viśaḥ prajā abhīke yuddhe abhīka iti saṃgrāma-nāmaitat* | *sam avavṛtranta saṃvartante parasparaṃ saṃgacchante ādit tadānīm eva neme kecana bhāgyavanto yodhakāḥ indra-yante yuddhe indram icchanti.* Geldner follows Sāyaṇa closely in the translation of both these pādas, and Ludwig in that of c only, explaining pāda d as 'then many show themselves Indras in the close fight'. Grassmann's translation of d is very similar; but pāda c is translated by him as 'when, in the close affray, the fighters form themselves into troops'. *This seems to indicate that he regarded avavṛtranta as derived from the same root as vrā and vrāta 'troop', and that he had abandoned his former opinion about its being a derivative of the root vṛt. It is, in fact, very doubtful if sam + vṛt can signify 'to meet, to encounter'.*

Now, the denominative root *indray* occurs in the RV in this one passage only; and there can be no doubt that, as opined by Ludwig and Grassmann, it means 'they behave, or act, like Indra'. Moreover, the RV is full of references to Indra's liberation of the rivers or waters that had been imprisoned by Vṛtra; and since pāda b explicitly mentions *arṇasāti* or 'battle for the winning of water', there can (it seems to me) be no doubt that *avavṛtranta* too is derived from a similar denominative root *vṛtrate* or *vṛtayate* and signifies 'they have behaved

like Vṛtra'. It is the third person plural of the 'pluperfect tense' (see Macdonell's *Vedic Grammar*, p. 364, S. 494) and is similar in formation to *adadṛhanta*, and *atitviṣanta* (see ibid. p. 365). The meaning of pādas cd is, 'While some clans fought, like Vṛtra, for confining or restricting the use of the waters, others, like Indra, fought to liberate the waters and extend their use.'

sam is an adverb and signifies 'together, at the same time' as in 8, 13, 2: *supārah suśravastamah sam apsujit* and 1, 64, 8: *kṣapo jinvantaḥ pṛṣatībhir ṛṣṭibhiḥ sam it sabādhaḥ śavasāhimanyavaḥ*.

(14) 5, 36, 4: eṣa grāveva jaritā ta in-
dreyarti vācam bṛhad āśuṣāṇaḥ |
pra savyena maghavan yaṃsi rāyaḥ
pra dakṣiṇid dharivo mā vi venaḥ ||

"Like the pressing stone, this singer, O Indra, raises the chant high, making a loud sound. O liberal one, thou givest riches with the left hand; do not, O thou with bay horses, be unfavourable with the right hand".

In respect of the comparison with the pressing stone, compare the observations under 10, 94, 6 explained above.

(15) 7, 93, 8: etā agna āśuṣāṇāsa iṣṭīr
yuvoḥ sacābhy aśyāma vājān |
mendro no viṣṇur marutaḥ pari khyan
yūyaṃ pāta svastibhiḥ sadā naḥ ||

"May we, calling loudly, O Agni, attain these desires, and riches, in the companionship of you two (sc. Indra and Agni). May not Indra, Viṣṇu and the Maruts overlook us: protect us always with (your) blessings".

Regarding *āsuṣāṇāsaḥ*, compare *manyamāno johavīmi* in 5, 4, 10: *yas tvā hṛdā kīriṇā manyamāno 'martyaṁ martyo johavīmi | jātavedo yaśo asmāsu dhehi prajābhir agne amṛtatvam aśyām*. "I mortal, who praising with a song of praise, invoke immortal thee, O Jātavedas, confer famous wealth on us—may I, O Agni, attain immortality with (my) progney" and 3, 11, 8; *pari viśvāni sudhitā 'gner aśyāma manmabhiḥ | viprāso jātavedasaḥ*. "May we, priests, obtain from Agni Jātavedas all benefits by means of (these) praises."

Besides the above, there are in the RV one verse, 1, 179, 4 (*lopāmudrā vṛṣaṇam nī riṇāti dhīram adhīrā dhayati śvasantam*) in which the participle *śvasantam*, and three verses, namely, 4, 1, 13 and 4, 2, 14; 16 in which the participle *āśuṣāṇa* occurs. These three verses have been explained above, while as for 1, 179, 4, it is plain that *śvasantam* signifies 'panting' here.

The words *śvasana*, *śvasīvas*, *śvasatha* and *abhiśvas*, all derived from the root *śvas*, are found used in the following RV passages:

(16) 1, 54, 5: ni yad vṛṇakṣi śvasanasya mūrdhani
śuṣṇasya cid vrandino roruvad vanā |
prācīnena manasā barhaṇāvatā
yad adyā cit kṛṇavaḥ kas tvā pari ||

This verse is addressed to Indra, and the interpretations that have been proposed by the exegetists vary widely from each other:

Yāska explains the first half briefly as *nivṛṇakṣi yac chvasanasya mūrdhani śabda- kāriṇaḥ | śuṣṇasyādityasya śoṣayitū rorūyamāṇo vanānīti vā vadheneti vā* in Nirukta 5, 16.

Durga, in his commentary on the Nirukta, explains the full verse as follows: nivṛṇakṣi nivarṇayasi yat yas tvaṃ he bhagavann indra meghaṃ hatvā śvasanasya śabdha-kāriṇaḥ vāyoḥ mūrdhani upari śuṣṇasya cit śoṣayitur api bhagavataḥ ādityasya vrandinaḥ mṛdu-bhāva-kartuḥ | ādityena hi paripacyamānam saṃstabdham api badara-tindukādi mṛdū-bhavati tasmād asau vrandī | tasyāpy evam-karma-kāriṇo maṇḍalaṃ praty ūrdhvam roruvat stanayitnu-śabdaṃ kurvāṇaḥ vanā vanāni vikṣipasi | ūrdhvam adhaśca vanāni udakāni vikṣipataḥ na te śaktipratīghāto 'stīty abhiprāyaḥ | pakṣe vanā ity eṣa śabdo meghavadheneti prayojyaḥ | udaka śabdaś caitasmin pakṣe 'dhyāhāryo nirvacanasambandhāt | prācīnena prāg-añcitena adīnena tasmin karmaṇy abhimukhena manasā barhaṇāvatā hiṃsāvatā yad adyācit adyatvepi tvaṃ karma kṛṇavaḥ karoṣyeva asukaram anyaiḥ tasmād bravīmi kas tvā pari | konyas tvām upari vartate | tvam-eva sarva-bhūtāni parigṛhya vartasa ity abhiprāyaḥ ||

Similar are the explanations of Sāyaṇa in his RV commentary and of Skandasvāmin-Maheśvara in their scholium on the Nirukta.

The same Skandasvāmin's explanation however of this verse in his commentary on the RV varies from the above and reads as follows: yat yasmāt nivṛṇakṣi niyamena hatavān asi | śvasanasya śvāsa-kāriṇaḥ mahā-śvāsasyety arthaḥ | mūrdhani mūrdhānaṃ mastakaṃ | śuṣṇasya śuṣṇa-nāmno 'surasya| vrandinaḥ atyanta-balavatvāt para-balānāṃ mṛdū-kartuḥ | atyanta-balavatā ityarthaḥ | roruvat śabdaṃ kurvan | vanā vana-śabdas tīkṣṇa-vacanaḥ | tīkṣṇena vajreṇa | vadha-vacanaḥ sāmarthyād vana-śabdaḥ | vadhena prahāreṇetyarthaḥ | prācīnena prāg-añcitena gatena aparāṅ-mukhena | utsāhavatetyarthaḥ | manasā | barhaṇāvatā vṛddhimatā hiṃsāvatā vā | yat yasmāt | adyācit adyāpi kṛṇavaḥ karoṣi īdṛśāni karmāṇi | tasmāt kastvāpari kas tavādhikaḥ kas tavopari | sarvasya tvam uparītyarthaḥ ||

Grassmann (*RV. Über*): "When, raging, thou hurlest down the spear on the head of the panting, devouring Śuṣṇa, if with strong aspiring courage thou wouldst act even today, who is there that can hinder thee?"

Geldner (*RV. Über.*); " When, (treading) on the head of the panting already lying Śuṣṇa, thou, roaring, tearest down the trees with confident aspiring mind,—if thou wouldst do so even today, who will stop thee?"

Ludwig: "wenn du nider schlägst an des brausenden [Luftstroms] spitze des Śuṣṇa geschloszene haufen, gewaltig brüllend die walder, mit vorwärts-gerichtetem sinne, mit starkgefestigtem, [und] auch [bei dem], was heute du tun wirst, wer ist dabei dir?"

Now, as observed by Macdonell (*Ved. Myth.*, p. 160) Indra ' releases the waters shattering Śuṣṇa's forts (1, 51, 11) obtains the receptacle of waters (*krivi*) in smiting Śuṣṇa (Vāl. 3, 8) or wins heavenly (*svarvatīḥ*) waters when he destroys the brood of Śuṣṇa (8, 40, 10)'; and as our verse mentions the smiting of Śuṣṇa Yāska and the other commentators named above seem to be right in holding that *vanā* signifies 'waters.'

Macdonell has also observed (*ibid.* p. 59) that 'conquering in the waters' (*apsujit*) is the exclusive attribute of Indra, and that 'Indra, being frequently described as slaying Vṛtra in the present or being invoked to do so, is regarded as constantly renewing the combat, which mythically represents the constant renewal of the natural phenomena'. This observation holds

good of the slaying of Śuṣṇa also; and in fact, it is the opinion of Sāyaṇa (*cp.* his explanation: vāyunā sūrya-kiraṇaiś ca vṛṣṭā āpaḥ sūryasyopari punar avasthāpyante / tad eva avasthāpanam indraḥ karotīty ucyate/...yad yasmāt adyācit adyāpi kṛṇavaḥ gharma-kale sūryasyopari bhaumān rasān avasthāpayasi varṣāsu varṣayasi) and of Skandasvāmin-Maheśvara (*op. cit.* adyāpi kṛṇavaḥ karoṣy evedaṃ karma) that pāda c refers to Indra's repetition, in the present, of the same exploits. I therefore translate the verse as follows:

"When thou smitest down on the head of the strong and roaring Śuṣṇa even, and when, shattering, thou drivest the waters, even now, with a forward-inclined and mighty spell, who is there by thy side?"

Regarding *śvasana,* note Yāska's explanation of it as *śabda-kārin* 'making a loud sound.'

vanā, in pāda b, should be construed as the object of both *roruvat* and of kṛṇavaḥ. The expression *roruvad vanā* occurs in pāda c (*akrandayo nadyo roruvad vanā*) of verse 1 also of this hymn and Roth regarded it (see Geldner, *RV. Über.*, p. 63, note on 1, 54, 1) as a participle of the root *ru* 'to shatter, to rend.' This meaning fits the context well in this verse; compare 1, 32, 1: *ahann ahim anv apas tatarda pra vakṣaṇā abhinat parvatānām.* 'He (sc. Indra) killed the serpent, shattered the waters and pierced through the inwards of the mountains'; 6, 30, 5: *tvam apo vi duro viṣūcīr indra dṛḷham arujaḥ parvatasya* 'Thou, O Indra, hast shattered on all sides the waters and the doors, the solid fortress of the mountain'; and 4, 16, 8: *apo yad adrim puruhūta dardaḥ.* 'When thou didst shatter the waters and the mountain, O thou that art much invoked.' Compare also 3, 31, 5: *vīḷau satīr abhi dhīrā atṛndan prācāhinvan manasā sapta viprāḥ.* 'The seven bards bored the (waters) that were in the fortress and drove them out with a forward-turned spell' (see above); and note that Indra's killing of śuṣṇa is mentioned in v. 8 (*sataḥ-sataḥ pratimānaṃ purobhūr viśvā veda janimā hanti śuṣṇam*) which follows immediately vv. 5-7 (these verses form one group; see above), and that the words *prācā hinvan manasā* are parallel to the words *prācīnena manasā kṛṇavaḥ* of our verse.

In the alternative, it is possible to regard *roruvat* as the participle of *ru* 'to cry,' and to interpret it as 'roaring.' *vanā* would then be the object of *kṛṇavaḥ* only, while, as the object of *roruvat*, we have to understand the "spell" (*manas*) mentioned in pāda c.

Regarding *vanā kṛṇavaḥ*, compare also 10, 130, 9: *apo mahīḥ...indra yās tvam vṛtratūrye cakartha* 'the mighty waters which, O Indra, thou didst drive forward on the occasion of the conquest of Vṛtra,' and likewise the observations above regarding *kaḥ*.

manasā=by means of a mantra or spell (of truth); see above.

The question *kas tvā pari* 'who is there by thy side?' is merely a rhetorical device adopted by the poet to state the fact that there was no one by the side of Indra to aid him in these exploits, and that Indra performed them single-handed. Compare the statements in v. 4 (*tvaṃ divo bṛhataḥ sānu kopayaḥ...*) and in v. 6 (*tvam āvitha naryaṃ turvaśaṃ yadum...*) of the same hymn where the poet lays stress on the word *tvam*; compare also likewise the other verses also of this hymn and note how the poet extols in this hymn the greatness of Indra only.

(17) 1, 140, 10: asmākam agne maghavatsu dīdihy
adha śvasīvān vṛṣabho damūnāḥ |
avāsyā śiśumatīr adīder
varmeva yutsu parijarbhurāṇaḥ ||

"O Agni, shine on our liberal (patrons); thou art a roaring bull, friend of the house. Throwing down the (mothers) with children, thou, speeding, hast shone like armour in battles."

The meaning of the expression *avāsyā śiśumatīḥ* in pāda c is obscure. According to Oldenberg (SBE. 46, 145) the *śiśumatīḥ* are either (1) the mothers of Agni represented as a young child, or (2) the Waters which Agni leaves resting on the surface while he himself rises to heaven, or (3) the woods and plants which Agni burns and throws down, as it were. I am inclined to think that the reference is to the *araṇīs* that produce Agni by friction.

(18) 8, 96, 7: vṛtrasya tvā śvasathād īṣamāṇā
viśve devā ajahur ye sakhāyaḥ |
marudbhir indra sakhyaṃ te astv
athemā viśvāḥ pṛtanā jayāsi ||

"O Indra, the All-gods, who were your friends, forsook you and fled in haste from the roar of Vṛtra. Let there be friendship, O Indra, between you and the Maruts; then thou canst vanquish all these armies."

The incident referred to here is thus described in Ait. Br. 3, 20, 1-2:

Indro vai Vṛtraṃ haniṣyan sarvā devatā abravīd: anu mopātiṣṭhadhvam upa mā hvayadhvaṃ iti | tatheti taṃ haniṣyanta ādravan | so 'ven:mām vai haniṣyanta ādrāvanti | hantemān bhīṣayā iti | tān abhi prāśvasīt | tasya śvasathād īṣamāṇā viśve devā adravan | Maruto hainaṃ nājahuḥ | prahara bhagavo jahi vīrayasvety evainam etām vācaṃ vadanta upātiṣṭhanta | tad etad ṛṣiḥ paśyann abhyanūvāca *vṛtrasya tvā śvasathād īṣamāṇā...*|| "Indra, verily, when about to slay Vṛtra said to all the gods: 'Keep close to me; call out to me (encouragingly).' Agreeing to this, they rushed forward to kill Vṛtra. He observed 'They are rushing forward to kill me; well, I shall frighten them.' He roared towards them; the All gods, fleeing in haste from his roar, ran away.[1] The Maruts however did not abandon him (Indra); they kept close to him, crying out, 'Smite, lord; kill, have courage.' Seeing this, the seer cried out, *vṛtrasya tvā...*"

Compare 6, 17, 10: *Yena navantam ahiṃ saṃ piṇag ṛjīṣin* with which (thunderbolt) O strong one (Indra thou didst strike down the roaring *ahi* (Vṛtra)' and also Mbh., 3, 100, 13: *jñātvā balasthaṃ tridaśādhipaṃ tu nanāda Vṛtro mahato ninādān | tasya praṇādena dharā diśaś ca khaṃ dyaur nagāś cāpi cacāla sarvam.*

1. Compare Mbh. 6, 92, 17: bhūyaś ca vinanādogram krodhasaṃraktalocanaḥ | trāsayāmāsa sainyāni yugānte jalado yathā and *ibid.* 6, 93, 11-12: tvaramāṇo Vṛkodaraḥ || prayayau siṃhanādena trāsayan sarva-pārthivān.

(19) 10, 92, 8: sūraś cid ā harito asya rīramad
indrād ā kaścid bhayate tavīyasaḥ ||
bhīmasya vṛṣṇo jaṭharād abhiśvaso
divedive sahurih stann abādhitaḥ ||

"He stopped the bay mares of this sun even. Every one is afraid of the stronger Indra, of the roar from the stomach of the fierce bull. The conquering one thunders every day unimpeded."

We have thus seen that in one passage (1, 179, 4) the root *śvas-śuṣ* signifies 'to pant, to breathe,' and that it has the meaning of 'to make a loud sound, to shout, to roar' in all the other RV passages in which verbal forms or participles of that root occur; and we have likewise seen that *śvas* has the latter meaning in the derivatives *śvasana*, *śvasīvas*, *śvasatha*, and *abhiśvas* in the *RV* passages in which these words are used.

It is interesting to note in this connection the close parallel that is offered by the verb *phūt* + *kṛ* which occurs frequently in classical Sanskrit literature. The original meaning of *phūt* — *kṛ* is 'to breathe out, to blow': and it has this sense in, for instance, the *Textus Simplicior* of the Pañcatantra (BSS ed. of Tantra I by Kielhorn, 1896), p. 83-1: *atha kecid vānarā vahni-kaṇa-sadṛśāni guñjā-phalāni vicitya vahni-vāñchayā phūt-kurvantaḥ samantāt tasthuḥ*. From this meaning has developed that of 'to make a loud sound, to cry out loudly' which *phūt*+*kṛ* has in *ibid.* 30-2: *tataḥ kṣaṇāc cetanaṃ labdhvā bhūyopi samutthāya phūtkartuṃ ārabdhaḥ | bho Āṣāḍhabhūte kva māṃ vañcayitvā gato'si* ; 35-11: *etasminn antare sā duṣṭā ūrdhva-bāhū vidhāya phūtkurvatī gṛhān niścakrāma*, and also in *ibid.* Tantra V (Bühler's ed. of 1891), p. 41-4: *te'pi tāḍyamānā eke mṛtā anye bhinna-mastakāḥ phūtkartuṃ upacakramuḥ*. But while the lexicographers have recognised in the case of *phūt* + *kṛ* that it has the latter-mentioned meaning also (see Apte, PW, etc.), they have not done so in the case of the root *śvas-śuṣ*.

ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ŚATAKATRAYĪ

BY

D. D. KOSAMBI.

In the course of preparation of a definitive critical edition of the *Śatakas* [*nīti*, *śṛṅgāra*, *vairāgya*] ascribed to Bhartṛhari and familiar to every student of Sanskrit literature, the most puzzling of the many problems that arose was of the authorship. Of course, a view has been propounded, which we shall have to consider later on, that the Śatakas are a mere anthology, so that discussing the author would be futile. But admitting for the moment the possibility of a unitary authorship, can anything be said about the author himself?

1. There are four major claimants, besides the actual author or authors of the Śatakatrayī stanzas, for the honour of being labelled *the* Bhartṛhari, namely. (1) The 7th century grammarian known as author of the *Vākyapadīya*. (2) A king of Central India, of unknown date. (3) A pontiff of the Kānphāṭā sect of ascetic almsmen. (4) The pseudo-Bhartṛhari [or pair!] who wrote the *Vijñānaśataka* and (or) the *Viṭavṛtta*. The last of these may be disposed of very quickly, but the first three have legends that have overlapped or even overlaid each other; inasmuch as we have nothing better to go upon, these legends must be discussed in some detail. Before making the best of such doubtful evidence, the name itself may be considered for a moment.

The form given in most MSS is Bhartṛhari. A common mislection is Bhartṛhara, even Bhatṛhari or Bhatṛhara; in the south, particularly in Telugu country or MSS influenced by Telugu sources, the name is pronounced and usually written Bharttulahari or Bharttṛlahari. Aufrecht, in his catalogue of Bodleian Sanskrit MSS reports the variant Bhartṛhema from MS No. 247. However, the name itself might be merely Hari, with a prefix; at least, Pūrṇasarasvatī, in his commentary *Vidyullatā* on the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa, commenting on the compound *katipaya* gives parallels from the *Vairāgyaśataka* with the note *iti Harivacanāc ca*. Several MSS at the Scindia Oriental Institute of Ujjain (particularly the colophons of Nos. 669,

711, 6360, 782, 6064] give the author or translator into Marāṭhī as Harikavi, which has caused a good deal of confusion, but the most reasonable interpretation seems to be that Harikavi is merely the equivalent of Bhartṛharikavi. At the end of the first kāṇḍa of the Vākyapadīya, Harivṛṣabha occurs, taken again as a reference to the grammarian author Bhartṛhari, but here at least there is the possibility that this may indicate some Harivṛṣabha as having commented upon the first kāṇḍa while Helārāja, to whom the commentary on both the sections is ascribed, commented only upon the second section. Taking Hari as the name, the prefix *bhartṛ* of unknown honorific or dedicatory significance like the *bhā* of Bhāviveka, Bhāmaha, Bhāravi, does not help much in dating the author. There are known with the same prefix, a kṣatrapa Bhartṛdāman [A.D. 284-9], son of Rudradāman II. Bhartṛsvāmin, author of the difficult grammatical poem *Rāvaṇavadha* or *Bhaṭṭikāvya* belongs to the period 500-650, and is some times identified with the author of the *Śatakatrayī* though only on the grounds that *Bhaṭṭi* in Prākrit is the equivalent of Bhartṛ. One Bhartṛprapañca flourished *circa* 500; Bhartṛyajña who commented upon Kātyāyana's *Śrautasūtras* before 800; Bhartarīśvara [=*Bhartṛ* +*īśvara*] is cited by Umbeka in his commentary upon Kumārilabhaṭṭa. The anthologies contain verses by Bhartṛmeṇṭha or simply Meṇṭha, who wrote under the poet-king Mātṛgupta of Kaśmīr; verses are also found ascribed to Bhartṛsārasvata. The prefix, by itself, cannot therefore date our poet, though it seems to show that the date could hardly be pushed back beyond the opening centuries of the Christian era.

2. *The Grammarian.* This particular Bhartṛhari is fairly easy to eliminate. He closes the long line of outstanding grammarians who shine from Pāṇini down, being the one able successor of Candragomin. Something definite of his life is known from the narrative of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim I-tsing [*A record of the Buddhist Religion...*, Trans. J. Takakusu, Oxford 1896] who travelled in these parts in A.D. 671-695. His narrative fixes the death of the grammarian Bhartṛhari as A.D. 651-2. I-tsing's account on pp. 178-180 with Max Muller's discussion on p. xiv identify this Bhartṛhari quite conclusively as the author of the *Vākyapadīya*. The only reason, however, for ascribing the *Śatakas* to him seems to originate from I-tsing's statement [p. 179] that he became seven times a priest only to return to the laity. This is supposed to fit the

"dual personality of the Indian", forever oscilating between the two opposed poles of sensuous enjoyment and ascetic renunciation. Unfortunately for this sort of criticism, I-tsing speaks of his grammarian-monk with evident admiration because he left the monastery whenever he felt that the impure thoughts which entered his mind might sully its precincts. In fact, Bhartṛhari died a lay-brother, *upāsaka*. A voluptuary who came because of dissatisfaction and went back to enjoy himself would have been mentioned only with contempt, even if the monastic rules of the seventh century had been lax enough to permit him such constant alternation. Of course, there is no mention of the grammarian having composed the *Śatakatrayī*, or even one of the *Śatakas*. To this must be added the fact that not only in the critical text under preparation where I have had to restore *juhvantam*, *ādhikyatama*, etc , but even in all the smoothest MS versions known of the *Śatakas* there occur solecisms like *śikṣatu* which no strict grammarian could possibly tolerate, and one sees that the author of the *Vākya-padīya* is an unlikely candidate for the honour. The same argument applies, incidentally, against the author of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya*, which is an epic poem deliberately written to illustrate grammatical forms, and read for that purpose rather than as poetry. Allowing for the maximum development any hard-working intellectual could be expected to achieve, it seems unlikely that a single mind could stretch from the formidable difficulties of Sanskrit grammar so ably handled in these works to the brilliant expression and loose syntax of the Śatakas At this point, one may as well dispose of the legend started by the learned but optimistic G. Bühler, who conjectured in answer to Takakusu's inquiry [p. 225] that the *Pei-na* which I-tsing stated to be the grammarian's best work might be the *Bedāvṛtti*, a commentary on the *Janmāmbhodhi*—supposedly a philosophical work of the type reported. The MS. of which the name prompted Bühler's conjecture is in the Bombay Government collection at the BORI, being No. 277 of 1873-4=381 of 1879-80. It has nothing whatever to do with Bhartṛhari, or grammar, or philosophy, or even poetry, being a work on astrology [*phalajyotiṣa*] written or copied in 1650 A.D. by a Jain called Rāmachandra, pupil of Sumatisūri.

My learned friend and former colleague Dr. V. V. Gokhale of the Fergusson College, Poona, has tentatively restored from

the original Chinese the stanza of Bhartṛhari reported by I-tsing [p. 179]; as

rāgān nivarte saṃsāram nirlobhī cīvaraṃ vase |
katham etad dvayen' āsmi bālavat parihāsitaḥ ||

Of the nearly 900 stanzas that I have found ascribed to our poet Bhartṛhari by various sources, not one approaches this remotely. Of the stanzas in the Śatakas, just one, *i.e.*, *maṇiḥ śāṇollidhaḥ* is utilized in the Vākyapadīya commentary (II) by Helārāja, and then not specifically ascribed to any one.

3. *The King.* In the history of Tāranātha [Schiefner, *Tāranāthas Geschichte d.Buddhismus*, p. 195] there is a reference to a king of Mālava by this name, in the form Bharthāri [which is approximately the form still found in MSS from Rājputānā, *i.e.*, Bharatarī or Bharatharī]. This Bhartṛhari's sister was married to Govicandra, and the king himself descended from an old line, not then extinct, of Mālava kings. The time is given very approximately as that of Dharmakīrti's death or later; if the logician Dharmakīrti is meant, and any credence can be given to Tāranātha's vague narrative, the king Bhartṛhari must be taken as having lived not earlier than the end of the seventh century A. D. No further information about the king is given. However, the mention of the thaumaturge Jālandhara a page or two later shows that this Bhartṛhari is unquestionably connected with the next on our list.

4. *The Nātha Bhartṛhari.* George Weston Briggs's standard work *Gorakhnāth and the Kānphāṭā Yogis* [Calcutta, 1938] contains most of what is generally known about the sect, though very little occurs there which could be of any use in our problem. Some of the chronology is rather mixed, as the Vikramāditya whom Briggs [p. 244] puts at 1076-1126 would presumably be the hero of Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkadevacaritam*, ruler of Kalyāṇī and not Ujjain, certainly not the brother of our Bhartṛhari, who is mentioned as a poet long before that date. The one indigenous unutilized source-book I have been able to find is the *Navanāthabhaktisāra* [cited as *NNBS*], a Marāṭhī version of the unpublished *Gorakṣa Kimiyāgāra.* This rendering in *ovī* metre covers 40 adhyāyas, and was promulgated in śaka 1741=1819 A.D. by one Mālū Naraharī, son of Dhuṃḍī. The story of Bhartṛhari, one of the nine chief leaders of the Nātha sect is given mainly in adhyāyas 24-30 of the *NNBS*. The name supposedly means a begging bowl;

bharatarī mhaṇatī bhikṣāpātrāsī [*NNBS* 1-88; 24-11] perhaps related to the Hindi *bartan*. The hero was born of the seed of the deathless sage Maitrā Vāruṇī ejected into his almsbowl, which conceived thereby; none of the nine siddhas given in the final śloka of *NNBS*:

> *Gorakṣa-Jālandhara-Carpaṭāś ca*
> *Adbaṅga-Kānīpha-Machindarādyāḥ*
> *Courangi-Revāṇaka-Bhartri-saññā*
> *bhūmyāṃ babhūvur navanāthasiddhāḥ*

was born of woman. Bhartri here is syncopated from Bhartṛhari. He was able to understand the language of animals, which enabled him to help Vikrama obtain the kingdom of Ujjain, for this, Vikrama regarded him as his brother [bandhū mānilā bhāvārthem *NNBS* 27-61], and bestowed a kingdom upon him. Having lost his beloved consort Piṅgalā, Bhartṛhari remained incosolable upon the cremation ground till Gorakṣnātha turned up, restored not one but twenty-five identical Piṅgalās by his superhuman powers, so converted the king to asceticism whereby he assumed his place among the nine principal leaders (some lists show 84 and even more) of the sect.

The play *Bhartṛharinirveda* by Hariharopādhyāya shows how popular this theme of Bhartṛhari's renunciation is among modern poets, but there is no evidence—in spite of the marginal " bharatharī " in MSS—to show that king Bhartṛhari or Nātha Bhartṛhari ever wrote any poetry. The palpably interpolated stanza '*yāṃ cintayāmi*' which is found in many Northern versions gives, according to all commentators of the *Śatakas*, a different reason for the renunciation. One would have imagined that the composers of the *Gorakṣa Kimiyāgāra* would have been literate enough to add Bhartṛhari's *Śatakas* to the triumphs of their sect, but there is no evidence to that effect. Of course, modern Nāthapanthīyas make up for this; for example, MS A_3 of my critical edition has the marginal dedications *Jālandhara* or *Nātha*. Rājendralal Mitra reported in his *Notices* [X, 3325] a MS of the *Vairāgyaśataka* with a commentary by Śrī Mīnanātha, who should be the Nāthasiddha of that name, perhaps identical with Matsyendra or Macchindernāth. Possibly, some of this is due to confusion with Central Indian kings of ancient days whose names began with Bhartṛ. Tod reports in his " Rājasthān " the tradition that the city of Bhartchwar was founded by king Bhartṛhari. Purohit Gopi Nath, in the preface

to his edition of the Śatakatrayī speaks of the former residence and a *samādh* of Bhartṛhari at Alor, near Sehwan on the Indus [*see also* Sobhrāj Nirmaldas in the J. Sind Historical Soc. Vol. VII, Pts. 1-2, July 1944, pp. 1-5], where the royal ascetic is supposed to have lived in exile. I am told that at or near Alwar there is another funerary monument of Bhartṛhari, as a place of pilgrimage for Kānphāṭā yogis; one more *samādh* is recorded by Briggs [p. 102] at Tilla, while followers of the sect have a shrine of some sort in Chunar fort though the cave of Bhartṛhari is shown near Ujjain. Apart from this extensive necrosis, we have the *NNBS* 40-94 tell us that the *siddhas* moved about openly till *śaka* 1710 [though *NNBS* records Bhartṛhari's birth at 3103 of the Kali era], and then disappeared into their secret places, Bhartṛhari's being pātāla; at the same time, several of them—not, apparently, including Bhartṛhari—took their leave of this earth in śaka 1000 [*NNBS* 23-173].

Naturally, all this does not enable us to date the Bhartṛhari concerned; the most we can conclude is that it is difficult for any ordinary mortal to extract historical information from the confused accounts of the Nāthapanthīya tradition. For the traditional association of Bhartṛhari with the Vikramāditya who is supposed to have established an era at 57 B.C., one can discover even less real support. Analysing the Vikrama tradition, it seems to me that the first Vikramāditya is the Gupta king of the 6th century, the actual era of about 57 B.C. dating less probably from the victory of a single great though unidentifiable king than from the approximate period of a popular Brahmanic revival which pushed back invaders all over the country. I base this upon a study of the two prophecies in the Āraṇeyaparvan of the Mahābhārata [adhyāyas 183-186 in V. S. Sukthankar's critical edition], combined with the account in the Kalki purāṇa, the story of the Jain ācārya Kālaka, and finally the coincidence [as nearly as can be ascertained from the earliest recorded dates] of the Kalki and the Vikrama era. One can hardly look for the accurate placing of the younger brother of a historical fiction.

5. *The two pseudo-Bhartṛharis.* The fourth group may also be disposed of without any trouble. The *Viṭavṛtta* is Madras Government MS. D. no. 11983, bound together with what purports to be a sort of a commentary on it by one Mādhava, the *Jaḍavṛtta*, D. no. 11970. The ascription of the

former to Bhartṛhari rests upon the following stanza in the latter:

upakṛtaye viṭavṛttaṃ paṭumatir akaroj janasya bhartṛhariḥ
jaḍamatinā jaḍavṛttaṃ mādhavanāmnā mayā tu racitaṃ idaṃ.

The only stanza in the rather obscure *Viṭavṛtta* which I have been able to find anywhere else is the maṅgalācaraṇa, namely *nitambālasagāminyā..*, which does occur as no. 10 in the *Subhāṣitāvali* of Vallabhadeva (or rather ascribed to Vallabhadeva, for it seems to be virtually identical with the unpublished *Subhāṣitāvali* of Śrīvara in the BORI MS collection).

The *Vijnāśataka* was published, as a work of Bhartṛhari, edited by Kriṣṇaśāstrī Bhāūśāstrī Ghule at the Gorakṣaṇa Press, Nagpur 1897. The edition is long out of print, though one copy exists in the Bhandarkar collection at the BORI, while another was received on loan by courtesy of MM. V. V. Mirashi, Principal of the Morris College, Nagpur. This latter copy has [on the margin, in red ink] variants noted from the original MS, which MS itself is apparently the fourth Śataka of Bhartṛhari referred to without details in the preface to Hiralal's Catalogue of MSS in Central India. There is a current edition of the *Vijñānaśataka* published by the Gujerati Press, Bombay, first issued in 1905. Though the order of the stanzas [of which two are omitted altogether] and some minor readings differ, I have been unable to ascertain whether this edition derives from another MS or from a mere arbitrary rearrangement of the Nagpur edition, [the latter seems the likelier alternative,] and there is no reason to believe that any other MS of the *Vijñānaśataka* exists except the one owned by the Ghulē family at Nagpur. The Ghulē MS was found in the collection of the editor's great-grandfather Sadāśiva, in a rather damaged condition. A colophon claims the work for Bhartṛhari while the final śloka makes it the fourth of the *Śatakas*. The editor himself believed it to be authentic on these grounds plus an occasional similarity of phrase with the *Śatakatrayī*; to others however, including MM. Mirashi, [not to speak of myself], it seems clearly a late and not particularly able forgery. For our purpose, it suffices to note that not a single one of the stanzas of either the *Viṭavṛtta* or the *Vijñānaśataka* is found in any

MS of Bhartṛhari's Śatakatrayī in spite of the fact that the MSS of the Śatakatrayī that I have been able to collect show a total of well over 600 different stanzas; nor is any such stanza ascribed to Bhartṛhari in any anthology, no. 10 of the Subhaṣitāvali being labelled *Viṭavṛttasya.* Kṛṣṇamachariar reports a *Śāntipaddhati* of Bhartṛhari published in Bombay, which I am unable to trace; it may be the *Śāntiśataka* of Śilhaṇa.

6. *The poet Bhartṛhari.* Nothing has been said in all the foregoing that can be regarded as a positive contribution to the authorship problem as regards the Śatakatrayī. As for the Śatakatrayī being an anthology, it will be seen from a paper of mine in the next issue of the JBBRAS that there is a substantial nucleus of the stanzas left after discarding those not found in all established versions. Though the work could not originally have been a Śatakatrayī, there is some sort of a common source for all the extant MSS, so that at best one can say that the anthology is of stanzas ascribed to Bhartṛhari, though the compendium was probably made long after the author's death. Now a poet Bhartṛhari is mentioned in the literature, so that an attempt at tracing him might be worth-while.

Somadeva, in the fourth *āśvāsa* of his *Yaśastilakacampū* [959 A.D.] puts Bhartṛhari in the long list of the great poets, *mahākavis*, who spoke favourably of the almsman's life [Kāvyamālā 70, II, p. 113]. Somadeva's list contains such great names as Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti, but also some others of whom nothing is known; technically, a *mahākavi* must deal with an epic theme in a connected narrative poem, or drama, but we might waive the point here and take the epithet literally, because nothing is known of Bhartṛhari beyond [at most] the quasi-anthological *Śatakas*. Somadeva's is the earliest dated reference to a poet Bhartṛhari. Paṇḍit Bhiṣmācārya, in his *Mahānubhāva* [old Marāṭhī] grammar of the 13th century gives an example of a simile "*jāisā bhartṛharicā vairāgya*", which is rather ambiguous, being more likely to refer to king Bhartṛhari's renunciation than to the author of the Vairāgya-śataka. If the king could be dated with or without reference to the date of Dharmakīrti and Gorakṣanāth as not decidedly earlier than the 13th century, we can dispose of the royal authorship of the Śatakas because there is an indisputable citation of our poet in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* [1304 A. D.] of the Jain ācārya Merutuṅga. The legend repeated in the last section of

that work was unquestionably not of recent origin; it gains interest by containing elements of the combined sagas of our first three Bhartṛharis. That is, according to Merutuṅga, not Bhartṛhari but his father is a grammarian who worships Gaṇeśa and succeeds in obtaining at the risk of his own life direct grammatical instruction for six months from the divine teacher. He then returns to Ujjain, is cared for by a prostitute [*veśyā*] on whose doorstep he had fallen asleep during the night from exhaustion caused by the journey, has a disputation at court, and becomes famous as the outstanding grammarian. Then he marries four wives, one from each of the major castes, and has a son by each, the one begotten of the *kṣatriya* wife being Vikrama; Bhartṛhari is son of the lowest, the *śūdra* woman while the other two brothers are not named in this particular version. The poor outcast has to sit in a cellar below his socially admissible brothers and signal understanding by tugging at a rope leading to his teacher, who teaches Sanskrit to all four. In a fit of anger at Bhartṛhari's obtuseness the tutor calles him *re veśyaputra*, son of a whore, which may be only a term of abuse, but is reminiscent of the hospitable meretrix who sheltered the grammarian father. The narrative at this point is further obscured by the fact that the stanza *dānaṃ bhogo nāśas* which is being explained by the pedagogue is unquestionably authentic in Bhartṛhari's Śatakas while the śloka *āyāsaśatalabdhasya* with which the cantankerous pupil Bhartṛhari is supposed to have countered occurs in the *Tantrākhyāyikā* without attribution, and is found in one of the two hundred odd MSS of the Śatakatrayī which I have personally examined, being reported in only one such MS anywhere, *i.e.* in Telang's MS *A* [Kāthavaṭe].

The real importance of Merutuṅga's story derives from its concluding phrase *tena bhartṛhariṇā vairāgyaśatakādi prabandhāni bhūyāṃsi cakrire*. This must be the poet in whom we are interested, whatever the credibility of the legend, and we may be certain that the Vairāgyaśataka was well established by the 13th century A.D. while its author had become legendary, or such a report would not have gained currency. To anticipate what belongs to a later discussion, let us state that the Vairāgyaśataka comes out very badly stripped by the critical editor's work, not more than 30 stanzas being above suspicion while not more than about 55 could be included as authentic on the most generous canon of textual criticism. The other two

Śatakas are much better off with approximately 75 stanzas each.

As a matter of fact the Merutuṅga legend is also unreliable. P. von Bohlen cites in the preface to his edition of the *Śatakas* the authority of Colebrooke and a MS of Śivadāsa's *Vetālapancaviṃśati* to the effect that Bhartṛhari and Vikrama were sons of king Candragupta. Mr. Seshagiri Śāstri [Ind. Ant. 1, 314] records an undocumented legend making Bhartṛhari the son of a Brahmin Chandra gupta, again with Vikram the son by a *kṣatriya* wife, etc. The full legend can be found recorded in its southern version by K. V. Subrahmaṇya Śāstri, formerly Sanskrit Pandit at the Madura College, in his *Śaṅkarācāryacaritram*. Here the Merutuṅga story of the father is paralleled (except that the *veśyā* is replaced by a *vaiśyā*) but we see that the real strength of the tradition comes from the line of Indian grammarians, later connected with the origin of the Vedantic doctrine. The father is the Brahmin Candraśarmā, reincarnation of Patañjali, he frees Gauḍapāda from a curse which turned him into a *rākṣasa*, learns the *mahābhāṣya*, transcribes it on leaves, and then reaches the royal court (presumably at Ujjain) to marry his four wives for the spread of the grammatical doctrine into all castes.

It seems to me that all the elements of the other parallel legends can be resolved here by identifying Candraśarman or Candragupta with the grammarian Candragomin, while Bhartṛhari would be the Vākyapadīya author. This saga of the grammarians cannot be traced far back from written records, but one finds a good version in Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita's *Patañjalicaritam* [Kāvyamālā 51] where the story is fairly well given along the lines just traced, and Bhartṛhari is called author of the *Vākyapadīya*, in viii-11, while viii-10 ascribes the three *Śatakas* to him. We are back again where we started.

7. *Minor legends*. A Bhartṛhari mentioned in the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa can be our poet but not the king. The stanza is *jayanto bhartṛharaye lakṣasvarṇena varṇayan; bhuktvā bhartṛharis tatra yogārūḍho vanam yayau.* The Bhartṛhari who would accept a hundred thousand pieces of gold from the unkonwn Jayanta, enjoy the bounty, and then betake himself to the forest as an ascetic would, if he existed, be rather the poet than the king. It is interesting to note that the *Nītisāra* section of the *Garuḍamahāpurāṇa* contains stanzas which occur

in the *Śatakas*, but according to Dr. A. P. Karmarkar (to whom I owe both these paurāṇic references) the latter *purāṇa* in its present form belongs to the post-Madhvācārya period.

Eminent Jains usually identify the *Śatakatrayi* author with that of the *Vākyapadīya*. This stand was taken at one time, though abandoned soon, by the vetern Jain scholar Śrī Nāthūrāma Premī in the preface to his edition of Śubhacandra's *Jñānārṇava* [Rāyacandra-jaina-śāstramālā 5-7-9, Bombay NSP 1907]. This preface gives on pp. 9-14, a Hindī translation of Śubhacandra's "biography" from the *Bhaktāmaracaritra* of Viśvabhūṣaṇa, pupil of Anantabhūṣaṇa, which make Śubhacandra and Bhartṛhari twin princes; Bhartṛhari takes to yogic practices, but is converted to Jainism by the superior powers of the twin. In support of Bhartṛhari having been a Jain, Śrī Premi cited the Vairāgyaśataka stanzā

ekākī niḥspṛhaḥ śāntaḥ pāṇipātro digambaraḥ |
kadā'haṁ sambhaviṣyāmi karmanirmūlanakṣamaḥ ||

Now, although we have a considerable number of unquestionably Jain MSS for the *Śatakatrayī* critical apparatus, including many of the Dhanasāra version, this stanza never occurs as reported here. It is quite as authentic as any other, and one of the very few that has no real variants. But the correct reading of the third quarter is *kadā śambho bhaviṣyāmi*, the changed reading enables *digambaraḥ* to be taken as meaning Digambara Jain, but there is actually no MS evidence for it. Śrī Premi further reported [p. 4 of his preface] the *Rāhatakāvya* as a work of Bhartṛhari, but cannot recall his source now. Not only have I been unable to find any notice of any such work by Bhartṛhari or anyone else, but the word *rāhata* does not seem to be Sanskrit at all. There is such a Hindi word meaning luxury or dissipation.

8. *Text criticism*. There is nothing left for it but what we can get about the author from the work itself, seeing that external evidence is so scanty as well as so confused. A favourite type of unsound argument is that of K. T. Telang, who concluded that Bhartṛhari was later than Kālidāsa but a good deal earlier than the sixth century! The arguments, given on p. xiii *et seq*. of Telang's preface to his edition (Bombay 1893) of the *Nīti* and *Vairāgya* are risible because he had not a critical text before him, either of the *Śatakas* or of works like the *Pañcatantra*. This lack has been remedied in

later time, and we find in Edgerton's reconstruction of the oldest level of the Pañcatantra that a certain number of stanzas there are found in our texts. In particular *satyānṛtā ca paruṣā* seems to be common to both. Though the grounds on which these stanzas were admitted by Edgerton's may not in all cases be the same as those on which we admit our own stanzas in the critical edition of the *Śatakas*, it still seems reasonable to assume that the earliest genuine stanzas of the *Nītiśataka* date from the opening centuries of the Christian era, tentatively, not later than about the 3rd century. As for the stanza common to Kālidāsa and Bhartṛhari, *bhavanti namrās taravaḥ* which occurs in Śākuntala V as well as the *Nītiśataka* [all versions], we can then say that Kālidāsa must have taken it from the proverbs current in his day—which day would presumably be the Gupta period. The *Vākyapadīya* Bhartṛhari would be eliminated by this, and also the Nātha guru, whether indentical with Tāranātha's king or not. The references to the ten *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, to *śaka* maidens, to the Ardhanāri Śiva, are each open to objection as omitted in one or more well-determined versions; none of them can be used for dating the text as a whole.

There is nothing specifically Buddhist or Jainistic about the *Śatakas*. It will, however, surprise most readers to learn that there is also nothing really Vedantic about them. The stanza *ekākī niḥspṛhaḥ* is genuine, but the mention of Śambhu there is perfunctory; the śaivite mangalācaraṇa stanza *cūḍottaṃsitacārucandrakalikā* is also genuine, but hardly deep Vedānta; dedication to some god or goddess of the sort is customary, though it says little about the actual religion of the writer. For example, the Buddhist Harṣa's *Nāgānanda* is charged with Gaurī worship. All the usually familiar vedāntic stanzas in Bhartṛhari, as for example most of those in the southern *paddhati* labelled *avadhūtacaryā* drop out of any critical text based upon the evidence as a whole. The thoroughly vedāntic mangalācaraṇa *dikkālādyanavacchinna* is also not original, though apparently a fairly early addition. One might as well call him a Vaiṣṇana because his name was Hari, or because of *itaḥ svapiti keśavaḥ*.

Looking at the verses as a whole, in any text, version, or recension, one is struck as was Winternitz [Geschichte d. Indischen Literatur III, 137], by the marked impression of unitary authorship. The truth of the matter is, obviously, that

a certain type of stanzas had been associated with the name of Bhartṛhari from the earliest times, and these attracted others by similitude (as in the case of the easily removed vedantic accretions) which rounded out the work. The only explanation for the remarkably divergent versions combined with the manifest desire in even the oldest (16th century) MSS to include all possible Bhartṛhari stanzas can come by assuming a later popularity for the work combined with early neglect. Taking only the authenticated stanzas, we find an unquestionable note of frustration dominant throughout: *boddhāro matsaragrastāḥ prabhavaḥ smayadūṣitāḥ, abodhopahatāś cānye jīrṇam aṅge subhaṣitam*.—The learned were consumed by jealousy, the lords of the earth by pride, and the rest too ignorant, so that the poet's epigrams had to wilt within him. The *vairāgya* desired by Bhartṛhari is always to be in the future conditional, not actually experienced, the *śṛṅgāra* again smacks less of a voluputary's practice then unsatisfied desire taken out in literary exercise of the imagination.

The background of the poet's figures of speech and phraseology is unquestionably Brahmanical, though not in the sense of argumentative religious contrast with other sects. No king who had renounced would have given the advice of the stanza *agre gītam*: "If before you you have the songs of accomplished southern poets and behind you the tinkle of ornaments worn by whisk-bearing attendant maidens, then be a glutton for worldly pleasures; if not, O! mind, hasten to enter into undisturbed contemplation". But the ordinarily Brahmanical turns are quite convincing: in *na kaccic caṇḍakopānām*, he says that the king's wrath burns even those who serve him as does the fire its officiating priest. If one has wealth, caste be consigned to the nether world: *jātir yātu rasātalam*. Why read the scriptures [*kiṃ vedaiḥ smṛtibhiḥ purāṇapaṭhanaiḥ śāstrair mahāvistaraiḥ*] when everything but realization of the inner spiritual joy is mercenary [*vaṇigvṛttayaḥ*], shopkeeper's practices? When begging, the pious high-caste people whose doors are dark with the smoke of many sacrificial fires are to be approached by prference: *puṇye grāme vane vā...ādāya nyāyagarbhadvijahutahutabhugdhūmadhūmropakaṇṭham*. Still restricting ourselves to reasonably well-confirmed stanzas, we can say that Bhartṛhari shows no acquaintance with any trade or profession except that of a hungry poet. The śloka *dīnā dīnamukhaiḥ* says, in effect: "If he did not visualize his wife

as seen by other men to be miserable, sad of countenance, always surrounded by pitiful, crying, hungry children, what man of self-respect would beg for the sake of his own accursed belly in quavering broken words that die in his very throat for fear of refusal?" It would not be surprising if such a writer had to await the rise of a considerable, Sanskrit-knowing, technically competent class before he could find his due measure of appreciation. He was aware of the poet's type of immortality:

jayanti te sukṛtino rasasiddhāḥ kavīśvarāḥ
nāsti yeṣām yaśaḥkāye jarāmaraṇajanmabhīḥ

This matches Horace's "Exegi monumentum aere perennius", and the fervent hope "Non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei, Vitabit Libitinam."

Yet, could he have foreseen the future, it must have been a peculiarly galling thought to him, after having suffered all the misery and shame that peeks through his verses, that far from living as an actual person in future ages, even his existence would one day be in doubt, to be thrashed out as a serious question in a painful and inconclusive manner by helpless scholars.

INDU, THE AUTHOR OF THE ANUNYĀSA

BY

DR. V. RAGHAVAN.

In his note 'Author of the Anunyāsa' in the last issue of this Journal (Vol. XV, pt. 1, pp. 25-7), Sri K. Madhava Krishna Sarma has given extracts from the Paribhāṣāvṛtti of Sīradeva to show clearly that the general impression about Maitreyarakṣita being the author of the Anunyāsa is wrong, that one Indu was the author of that work, and that not only were the two, Indu and (Maitreya) Rakṣita different persons, but these two writers differed from each other in their views.

The Durghaṭavṛtti composed by Śaraṇadeva in A.D. 1172 (*TSS edn.*) is a work earlier than Sīradeva's Paribhāṣāvṛtti, and the evidence of that work supports the finding of Sri Madhava Krishna Sarma. Śaraṇadeva quotes the Anunyāsa fourteen times and Indu once. The point discussed in the second extract from Sīradeva made by Sri Madhava Krishna Sarma occurs in the Durghaṭavṛtti in two places, pp. 64 and 67. In the second instance, Indu[1] is expressly mentioned and Rakṣita is immediately referred to as differing from him. Dr. T. R. Chintamani draws my attention in this connection, to the separate mention of Anunyāsa and Rakṣita as two distinct authorities by Ujjvaladatta also.[2]

1. Indu, the grammarian, is quoted in the Mādhavīya-dhātuvṛtti too, under Bhvādi, p. 667, Mysore edn.

2. *See* RASB. Catalogue, Vol. VI, Ms. No. 4360.

HISTORY OF MEDICINE IN INDIA

A few questions deserving further investigation and elucidation

BY

DR. D. V. S. REDDY, *Madras Medical College, Corresponding Member, American Association for History of Medicine.*

Tradition, as well as the oldest Purāṇas, mentions Brahmā as the Fountain-head and source of all Knowledge, including the Āyurveda. The ancient Egyptians deified and worshipped, as the God of Healing, Imhotep. May it not be that Imhotep is only a currupt form or variant of the pronunciation of the word Brahmadev? Brahma is also known as Dhātā and Thoth is one of the foremost Gods of ancient Egypt, where temples were built for the God, Thoth.

No reference can be traced to Dhanvantari in the early Vedic or Upanishadic literature. He appears first in the Epics, Mahābhārata, Rāmāyaṇa, Bhāgavata, etc. He is not mentioned in the older lists of the Founders and Teachers, of Āyurveda like Brahmā, Indra, Aśvins, Bharadvāja, Ātreya, etc. He is said to be the son of the King of Kāśī and was later regarded as one of the 24 Avatars of Viṣṇu and deified and worshipped, probably by a section, not willing to worship the older Vedic Deity of Healing, Rudra the Vaidyanātha. The usual explanation of the name is that he is one concerned with the healing of the wounds caused by the Bow (Dhanva) but the Sanskrit Scholars and philologists are not agreed on the derivation of the word or its meaning. One possibility is that about the begginning of the Christian era, or a little earlier, the frequent political and commercial contacts between India and Egypt might have brought into the country some habits, and knowledge as well as deities and traditions, amongst which one may be the importation of the Egyptian God of Healing, who was, by then, known as a human being, a vazier of the King, deified as the God of Healing. In all the pictures, the Egyptian God of Healing is represented as a person carrying a Bow and hence the name Dhanvan or Dhanvantar.

Ancient Vedic tradition and the Puranic story agree about the stealing of the Vedas by a Non-Āryan, called Somaka, probably a follower of the Cult of the Soma Juice or a scion of the Lunar Race. It is said that Viṣṇu took the

shape of a fish, chased the man through the seas and down into the waters and killed him and rescued the Vedas. Two interesting conjectures are permissible:

(*a*) The Āryans were recording their Knowledge, their history or rituals and procedures to enable successive generations to derive the full benefit of the accumulated wisdom of the ages. But when the non-Āryans began to steal their Knowledge and secrets of power, they immediately decided not to commit to writing anything of value. Hence the sudden disappearance of all kinds of records.

(*b*) The second conjecture is that the knowledge or Vedas stolen by Somaka found a way into ancient Egypt or Assyria and were preserved there as Papyri and Tablets respectively.

The story of the churning of the ocean by Devas and Dānavas to obtain ambrosia or immortal drink, occurs first in our Purāṇas. The story is now known to have a historical and pictorial basis in the records and sculptures of ancient Assyrians and Babylonians. The incorporation of the story and tradition into the Hindu Epics and tradition may be due to the usual custom of the ancient world to borrow and incorporate ideas, knowledge, traditions, procedures from the neighbouring or advanced cultures and peoples. Even a cursory perusal of the names and customs of the people of Ur of the Chaldeans is bound to impress one with the close resemblances between the two cultures and their legends.

The Aśvins are the earliest physicians or surgeons mentioned in the Vedas, as the people who give first-aid on the battle-field and also relief to the maimed and the sick. The early medical tradition also gives them a very important place as teachers and practitioners of the science of life. They are later referred to as Aśvinīkumāras, the sons or followers of the cult of Aśvins. They are heard of in many places and in different ages, or epochs. They were always youthful. Take up a book on the mythology and medicine of Ancient Greece, the cradle of European medicine, and civilisation. Centaurs, fancifully described as monsters with the body of the horse and the head of human beings, are the respositories of wisdom and go about giving medicines and succour to people in distress. The God of Healing is Aesculapius, which sounds like and suggests Aśvinakula. The father of medicine was called Hippocrates and it is likely there were

many of that name before and after him. Hippo means horse and Crates signifies a man. Probably, Hippocrates belonged to a family who called themselves so, on account of their traditional devotion to the study and practice of medicine as the Aśvinīkumāras did in India or it may be that he took this name after his wanderings in the Orient, in search of knowledge.

Not only the Gods of healing but also the votive offerings in the temples of Greece and the interpretation of dreams, bear close resemblance to Indian culture. But the most intriguing word is "Cos," the island of Cos, famous as the Greek centre of medical education and medical relief. Certainly, *Kāśī* on the Ganges was famous all over the ancient world as a centre of learning and medical education, even in the days of Buddha and Cos may be no other than an echo or borrowed name, to indicate a centre of knowledge and medical teaching. The practice of borrowing place names or names of heroes was an established custom even in those days.

The early medical texts of India are lost. The lectures of Ātreya, Professor of Medicine in the University of Takshsila, were recorded by his six or eight pupils. Only the notes of one or two of his disciples (Agniveśa, Bhela) have survived and were later redacted by Caraka etc. These classics have all the characteristics of the early books of ancient India being discussive dialogues. But, the Suśruta Saṁhitā appears suddenly as a ripe and well arranged compendium and from the manner, method and contents, appears to be a much later production. Sanskrit Scholars and Puranic Pandits give it a hoary antiquity, some sending it back to Tretāyuga and Viśvāmitra, others placing it in the pre-Buddhistic era, while the more critical minds are not prepared to give it a date earlier than the first or second century A.D. It is also generally believed that Nāgārjuna edited and added to it the Uttara Tantra. Who this Nāgārjuna was and when he lived are still to be settled. But, from the advanced knowledge and practice of dissection of human body, and also from the systematised and simple manner, free from extravagant metaphysical and philosophical discussion, one would be inclined to think that the book is also not indigenous to India and that it was a new book imported into the country from the school of Alexandria, probably a work of *Erasistras* the greatest anatomist and surgeon of Pre-Christian era. The word Sistras has either by

usage or by a deliberate change become Suśruta, not a farfetched or unimaginable variation, when one remembers the transformations the names of Hindu kings have undergone in the records of the Greek writers and the curious modifications that the Greek and foreign names have assumed in Indian records, history and languages. A well-known book on Medicine of the famous Roman writer Celsus might have been put into Sanskrit garb and in Indian setting. The first half of the word Cel disappears and the second half Sus, remains. Or a book of some foreign author was put into Sanskrit, on account of the novelty, utility and readableness of the book and given the attractive title Suśrutam. one that is good to hear. It may be that both factors might have been at work, in the naming of the work.

One of the famous books of the School of Salerno, Regimen Sanitas was used as a textbook in medieval Europe for centuries, on account of the ,wealth of ideas and the elegance of presentation of these ideas in the form of a poem, easily readable and memorised. The credit for introducing this book to Europe belongs to Constantine the Africanus, a scholar of Carthage, who studied in and then trecked through the Orient studying for 30 years and collecting books and translating them. The original of the Regimen may be no other than Cāru Caryā, beautiful living, a poem in Sanskrit written by Bhoja (or Kṣemendra) or the Sūtrasthāna of Suśruta or Vāghbaṭa dealing with Principles of healthy living and personal hygine.

श्रीः

॥ अथ अनुमानलक्षणम् ॥

साधनधर्मदर्शनात् साध्यधर्मविशिष्टे धर्मिणि बुद्धिरनुमानम् । व्याप्यं साधनम्; व्यापकं साध्यम्; व्याप्तिः अविनाभावः । सा चाविनाभावसंशब्दिता व्याप्तिः द्विविधा—अन्वयव्याप्तिर्व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिश्चेति । अन्वयमुखेन व्याप्तिरन्वयव्याप्तिः; व्यतिरेकमुखेन व्याप्तिर्व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिः । साधनसद्भावे साध्यसद्भावोऽन्वयः; साध्याभावे साधनाभावो व्यतिरेकः । अन्वयनियमोऽन्वयव्याप्तिः, साधनसद्भावे साध्यसद्भावनियमोऽन्वयव्याप्तिरित्यर्थः । साध्यसामान्येन साधनसामान्यस्यानुगम्यमानता यथा—यत्र धूमस्तत्राग्निरस्त्येवेत्यग्निना धूमस्यानुगम्यमानता । व्यतिरेकनियमो व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिः, साध्याभावे साधनाभावनियम इत्यर्थः । साधनसामान्याभावेन साध्यसामान्याभावस्यानुगम्यमानता यथा—यत्राग्निर्नास्ति तत्र धूमोऽपि नास्त्येवेति धूमाभावेनाग्न्यभावस्यानुगम्यमानता । तदेवं व्याप्यं साधनम्; व्यापकं साध्यम्; साधनमेव धर्मः साधनधर्मः; साध्यमेव धर्मः साध्यधर्मः; साधनधर्मदर्शनात् साध्यधर्मविशिष्टे धर्मिणि बुद्धिरनुमानम् । एतदुक्तं भवति फलतः-साधनधर्मविशिष्टधर्मी[र्मि]दर्शनात् साध्यधर्मविशिष्टे धर्मिणि बुद्धिरनुमानमिति । यदि वा साधनं धर्मो यस्यासौ साधनधर्मा; तस्य साधनधर्मणो दर्शनं साधनधर्मदर्शनम्; तस्मात् साधनधर्मदर्शनात् साध्यधर्मविशिष्टे धर्मिणि बुद्धिरनुमानमिति कण्ठोक्तमेव । तदुक्तम्—

"असिद्धेनैकदेशेन गम्यः सिद्धेन बोधकः" इति ।

भाष्यकारेणाप्युक्तम्—

"एकदेशदर्शनादेकदेशान्तरे असन्निकृष्टेऽर्थे बुद्धिः" इति ।

द्विविधमनुमानं सामान्यतोदृष्टम्, विशेषतोदृष्टं च । नित्यानुमेयार्थविषयं सामान्यतोदृष्टम्; यथा—देशान्तरप्राप्तिलिङ्गादादित्यगत्यनुमानम् । कार्यता[र्यात्] कारणानुमानं सामान्यतोदृष्टमिति केचित् । यथा—विद्युदादिकार्यदर्शनात् तत्कारणं किंचिदस्तीत्यनुमानम् । प्रत्यक्षयोग्यार्थविषयं विशेषतोदृष्टम् । यथा—धूमादग्न्यनुमानम् । विशिष्टलिङ्गेन विशिष्टलिङ्ग्यनुमानं विशेषतोदृष्टमिति केचित् । यथा—चन्दनधूमेन चन्दनाग्न्यनुमानम् । तत्पुनर्द्विविधम्—स्वार्थं परार्थं च । परोपदेशानपेक्षं स्वार्थम्; परोपदेशसापेक्षं तु परार्थमिति । परोपदेशस्तु पञ्चावयवं वाक्यम् । प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरणोपनयनिगमनान्यवयवाः । प्रतिज्ञोपदेशनिदर्शनानुसन्धानप्रत्याम्नाया अवयवा इत्यर्थः ॥

तत्र हेत्वाकाङ्क्षाजनकं पक्षवचनं प्रतिज्ञा । यथा—मिथ्या जागरितमिति । तृतीयापञ्चम्योरन्यतरविभक्त्यन्तं साधनवचनं हेतुः । यथा—दृश्यत्वेन दृश्यत्वादिति । स त्रिविधः—अन्वयव्यतिरेकी, केवलान्वयी, केवलव्यतिरेकी चेति । तत्र पञ्चरूपो ऽन्वयव्यतिरेकी ; चतूरूपस्तु केवलान्वयी, केवलव्यतिरेकी च । नैतच्चतूरूपत्वमनयोर्लक्षणम्, किन्त्वन्वयव्यतिरेकिलक्षणस्य पञ्चरूपस्य व्यभिचारनिराकरणार्थमेतद्वचनम् । रूपाणि पुनः—पक्षधर्मत्वम्, सपक्षे सत्त्वम्, विपक्षाद्व्यावृत्तिः, अबाधितविषयत्वम्, असत्प्रतिपक्षं[क्षत्वं] चेति । प्रतिपिपादयिषितधर्मविशिष्टो धर्मी पक्षः; तद्व्यापकत्वं हेतोः पक्षधर्मत्वम् । साध्यसमानधर्मा धर्मी सपक्षः, साधर्म्यदृष्टान्तः सपक्ष इत्यर्थः ; तत्र वृत्तिमात्रं हेतोः सपक्षे सत्त्वम् । साध्यव्यावृत्तधर्मा धर्मी विपक्षः, वैधर्म्यदृष्टान्तो विपक्ष इत्यर्थः ; तस्मिन् हेतोरगमनं विपक्षाद्व्यावृत्तिः । प्रमाणाविरुद्धे प्रतिज्ञातार्थे वृत्तिरबाधितविषयत्वम् । साध्यतद्विपरीतयोः साधनस्य त्रिरूपत्वमसत्प्रतिपक्षत्वम्—एतानि पञ्चरूपाण्यन्वयव्यतिरेकिणो विद्यन्त इत्यन्वयव्यतिरेकी पञ्चरूपः । विपक्षाभावेन विपक्षाद्व्यावृत्त्यभावात् केवलान्वयी चतूरूपः । सपक्षाभावेन सपक्षवृत्त्यभावात् केवलव्यतिरेक्यपि चतूरूप एव । नैतदनयोर्लक्षणम्, किं तु पूर्वोक्तस्यान्वयव्यतिरेकिलक्षणस्य पञ्चरूपस्यातिव्याप्तिपरिहारार्थमेतद्वचनम्, लक्षणस्यानयोरग्रे वक्ष्यमाणत्वात् ; अन्यस्य च व्यभिचारित्वात् ॥

तत्रान्वयव्यतिरेकी द्विविधः—सपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिः, सपक्षव्यापकश्चेति । तत्र सपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—मिथ्या जाग्रद्भेदो धर्मी, प्रतियोगिसापेक्षत्वात्, स्वप्न[स्वप्न]प्रपञ्चवदिति । सपक्षव्यापको यथा—मिथ्या जाग्रत्प्रपञ्चः, दृश्यत्वात्, स्वप्नप्रपञ्चवदिति । अथवा जन्मवदाकाशम्, अनित्यगुणाश्रयत्वादिति सपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिः । विभक्तत्वादिति सपक्षव्यापकः । पक्षव्यापकस्सपक्षवृत्तिरविद्यमानविपक्षः । केवलान्वयी, पूर्ववद् द्विविधः; तद्यथा—विवादास्पदीभूतः कर्तृत्वादिः परमार्थत आत्मधर्मो न भवति, दृश्यत्वादिति सपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिः, प्रसिद्धत्वादिति सपक्षव्यापकः; पक्षव्यापको विद्यमानविपक्षोऽपि सपक्षाद्व्यावृत्तः केवलव्यतिरेकी यथा—वाङ्मनसगोचरातीतः प्रत्यगात्मा, बोद्धृत्वात्; यस्तु वाङ्मनसगोचरातीतो न भवति स बोद्धापि न भवति, यथा घटादिरिति । प्रसङ्गद्वारेण वा—नेदं जीवच्छरीरं निरात्मकम् अप्राणादिमत्त्वप्रसङ्गात्, लोष्टवदिति । एतेन सर्वहेत्वाभासानामहेतुत्वमुक्तं भवति ॥

हेतुलक्षणरहिता हेतुवदवभासमाना हेत्वाभासाः । असिद्धविरुद्धानैकान्तिकानध्यवसितकालात्ययापदिष्टप्रकरणसमसत्प्रतिसाधना हेत्वाभासाः । तत्रानिश्चितपक्षवृत्तिरसिद्धः । पक्षविपक्षयोरेव वर्तमानो विरुद्धः । पक्षत्रयवृत्तिरनैकान्तिकः । साध्यासाधकः पक्ष एव वर्तमानोऽनध्यवसितः । बाधितप्रतिज्ञानन्तरमुपन्यस्तः कालात्ययापदिष्टः । पक्षप्रतिपक्षयोस्त्रिरूपः प्रकरणसमः । एकत्र तुल्यलक्षणविरुद्धहेतुद्वयोपनिपातो विरुद्धाव्यभिचारी सत्प्रतिसाधनः ॥

तत्रासिद्धो द्वादशविधः—स्वरूपासिद्धो यथा—परमार्थसत्यं द्वैतम्, स्वयंप्रभत्वात्। अधिकरणासिद्धो यथा—बहवः पुरुषाः, सुखदुःखादीनां व्यवस्थितत्वात्। विशेषणासिद्धो यथा—परमार्थः प्रपञ्चः, स्वयंप्रभत्वे सति नानारसत्वात्। विशेष्यासिद्धो यथा—[परमार्थः प्रपञ्चः]नानारसत्वे सति स्वयंप्रभत्वात्। भागासिद्धो यथा—परमार्थः प्रपञ्चः, चाक्षुषत्वात्। आश्रयासिद्धो यथा–सन्ति परमाणवः, द्व्यणुकादिक्रमेण कार्यारम्भकत्वात्। आश्रयैकदेशासिद्धिर्यथा—नित्या जीवेश्वरपरमाणवः, अनादित्वात्। व्यर्थविशेषणासिद्धो यथा—परमार्थसत्यं द्वैतम्, जडत्वे सत्यबाध्यत्वात्। व्यर्थविशेष्यासिद्धो यथा—परमार्थसत्यं द्वैतम्, अबाध्यत्वे सति जडत्वात्। सन्दिग्धासिद्धो यथा—धूमबाष्पादिविवेकानिश्चये कश्चिदग्निमानयं प्रदेशः, धूमवत्वात्। सन्दिग्धविशेषणासिद्धो यथा—अद्यापि क्लेशदूषितबुद्धी कणादाक्षपादौ, अद्याप्यनुत्पन्नतत्त्वज्ञानत्वे सति पुरुषत्वात्। सन्दिग्धविशेष्यासिद्धो यथा—अद्यापि क्लेशदूषितबुद्धी कणादाक्षपादौ, पुरुषत्वे सति सर्वदा तत्त्वज्ञानरहितत्वात्। एतेऽसिद्धभेदाः यदोभयवाद्यसिद्धत्वेन विवक्षितास्तदोभयासिद्धा भवन्ति। यदोभयवाद्य[यदान्यतरा]सिद्धत्वेन विवक्षितादताः [विवक्षिताः]तदान्यतरासिद्धा भवन्तीति॥

विरुद्धोऽष्टविधः। तत्र सति सपक्षे चत्वारो विरुद्धाः। पक्षविपक्षव्यापको यथा—सत्यं जागरितम्, अज्ञानकल्पितत्वात्। विपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिः पक्षव्यापको यथा—सत्यो जागरितनद्भेदो[तभेदो]धर्मी प्रतियोगिसापेक्षत्वात्। [सपक्ष]विपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—सत्यं जागरितं धर्मि, प्रतियोगिसापेक्षत्वात्। पक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्विपक्षव्यापको यथा—वाय्वाकाशे महाभूते न भवतः,स्पर्शवत्त्वात्। असति सपक्षे चत्वारो विरुद्धाः। पक्षविपक्षव्यापको यथा—विवादास्पदीभूतः कर्तृत्वादिः परमार्थत आत्मधर्मः, प्रसिद्धत्वात्। पक्षविपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—विवादास्पदीभूतकर्तृत्वादि(तदिकं गतचिदाभासेन) परमार्थत आत्मधर्मः, धर्मफलत्वात्। पक्षव्यापको विपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—विवादास्पदीभूतः कर्तृत्वादिः परमार्थत आत्मधर्मः, कर्मफलत्वात्। विपक्षव्यापकः पक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—सर्वं जडं चिदात्मनि कल्पितम्, अनादित्वात्। ननु चत्वार एव विरुद्धभेदाः, नान्ये, तेषामसिद्धलक्षणोपपन्नत्वेनासिद्धत्वम्; नैष दोषः, उभयलक्षणोपपन्नत्वेनोभयव्यवहारविषयत्वात्; तुलायां प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारवत्॥

अनैकान्तिकोऽष्टविधः। पक्षत्रयव्यापको यथा—सत्यं जागरितम्, प्रसिद्धत्वात्। पक्षव्यापकः सपक्षविपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—वेदैकसमधिगम्यः प्रत्यगात्मा, पुरुषार्थत्वात्। पक्षसपक्षव्यापको विपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—गौरयम्, विषाणित्वात्। पक्षविपक्षव्यापकः सपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—नायं गौः, विषाणित्वात्। पक्षत्रयैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—इन्द्रियाणि वाक्चक्षुःपाणिपादाः, ज[ज्ञा]नोत्पत्तौ साधकतमत्वात्। पक्षसपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्विपक्षव्यापको यथा—पृथिव्याकाशौ महाभूते, अमूर्तत्वात्। तत्र विपक्षत्वाभिमते ब्रह्मणी सगुणनिर्गुणे। पक्षविपक्षैकदेशवृत्तिः सपक्षव्यापको यथा—न महाभूते पृथिव्याकाशौ, अमूर्तत्वात्॥

षोढानध्यवसितः । अविद्यमानसपक्षविपक्षः पक्षव्यापको यथा—सर्वं क्षणिकम्, रसत्वात् [सत्त्वात्] । अविद्यमानसपक्षविपक्षः पक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—सर्वं क्षणिकम्, कार्यत्वात् । विद्यमानसपक्षविपक्षः पक्षव्यापको यथा—नित्या भूः, गन्धवत्त्वात् । विद्यमानसपक्षविपक्षः पक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—नित्ये भूजले, गन्धवत्त्वात । अविद्यमानविपक्षो विद्यमानसपक्षः पक्षव्यापको यथा—सर्वं जडं नित्यम्, बाध्यत्वात् । अविद्यमानविपक्षो विद्यमानसपक्षः पक्षैकदेशवृत्तिर्यथा—सर्वं जडं परमार्थसत्यम्, उत्पत्तिमत्त्वात् । अनध्यवसितोऽसाधारणानैकान्तिको नाम कश्चिदनैकान्तिकभेदो न पृथक् हेत्वाभास इति केचित् । अस्मिंस्तुऽपक्षेऽनिश्चायकत्वं संशयहेतुत्वं चानैकान्तिकसामान्यलक्षणं द्रष्टव्यम् ॥

कालात्ययापदिष्टः षड्विधः । प्रत्यक्षविरुद्धो यथा—अनुष्णोऽग्निः, कार्यत्वात् । अनुमानविरुद्धो यथा—चक्षू रूपोपलब्धिं न करोति, इन्द्रियत्वात् । शास्त्रविरुद्धो यथा—अग्नीषोमीयादिरनर्थहेतुः, प्राणिप्रमापनत्वात्, वृथाप्राणिहिंसनवत् । अर्थापत्तिविरुद्धो यथा—नायमग्निर्दाहशक्तिमान्, द्रव्यत्वात् आकाशवदिति । उपमानविरुद्धो यथा—नायं गवयो गोसदृशः, चतुष्पात्त्वात्, अश्ववदिति । योग्यानुपलब्धिविरुद्धो यथा—अश्वादयो विषाणिनः चतुष्पात्त्वात् गोवदिति । अनुभवविरुद्धो यथा—विवादास्पदीभूताः कामसंकल्पादयो मनोधर्मा न भवन्ति, जनिमत्त्वात्, घटवदिति ॥

प्रकरणसमस्योदाहरणम् यथा—नित्यः शब्दः, पक्षसपक्षयोरन्यतरत्वात्, सपक्षवदिति ॥

सप्रतिसाधनस्योदाहरणम्—बुद्धिपूर्वा वेदाः, वाक्यत्वात्, लौकिकवाक्यवत् । अबुद्धिपूर्वा वेदाः, अहरहर्व्यवह्रियमाणत्वे सत्यस्मर्यमाणकर्तृकत्वात्, आत्मवदिति ॥

सम्यग्दृष्टान्ताभिधानमुदाहरणम् । सम्यगभिधानमुदाहरणमित्युक्ते प्रतिज्ञादेरप्युदाहरणत्वप्रसङ्ग इति दृष्टान्तग्रहणम् । दृष्टान्ताभिधानमसम्यगप्यस्तीति सम्यग्ग्रहणम् । व्याप्तिग्रहणभूमिर्दृष्टान्तो यत्र स्थित्वान्वयव्यतिरेकिव्याप्तिग्रहणम् । यत्र लौकिकपरीक्षकाणां बुद्धिसाम्यं दृष्टं स दृष्टान्तः, तस्य सम्यगभिधानमुदाहरणम् । तद्द्विविधम्—अन्वयमुखेन दृष्टान्ताभिधानं साधर्म्योदाहरणम्, यथा—मिथ्या जागरितं दृश्यत्वात्; यद्दृश्यं तन्मिथ्या, यथा स्वप्नदृश्यमिति । व्यतिरेकमुखेन दृष्टान्ताभिधानं वैधर्म्योदाहरणम्; यन्मिथ्या न भवति तद्दृश्यमपि न भवति, यथा दृक्स्वरूपमिति । एतेनोदाहरणाभासानामनुदाहरणत्वमुक्तं भवति ॥

उदाहरणलक्षणरहिता उदाहरणवदवभासमाना उदाहरणाभासाः; ते च द्वादशविधाः—षट् साधर्म्योदाहरणाभासाः, तथा षड्वैधर्म्योदाहरणाभासा इति । मनसो नित्यत्वमात्रविशेषवादिवैशेषिकैकदेशीयः कश्चिद्वैशेषिकं प्रत्याह—अनित्यं मनः, मूर्तत्वादिति; तस्मिन्नेव प्रयोगे सर्वेऽप्युदाहरणाभासाः प्रदर्श्यन्ते । यथा—

यद्यन्मूर्तं तत्तदनित्यं दृष्टम्, यथा परमाणुरिति तद्दृष्ट्या साध्यविकलम् । यथा कर्मेति साधनविकलम्। यथा आकाशमिति उभयविकलः। यथा वन्ध्यापुत्र इति आश्रयहीनः। घटवत् इति अनुगमः। यन्नित्यं तन्मूर्तं दृष्टमिति विपरीतानुगमः। अन्त्यौ तु वचनदोषौ। एते षट् साधर्म्योदाहरणाभासाः। यत्तु नित्यं तन्मूर्तमपि न भवति यथा परमाणुरिति साधनव्यावृत्तम्। यथा कर्मेति साध्यव्यावृत्तः। यथा घट इति उभयव्यावृत्तः। यथा वन्ध्यापुत्र इति आश्रयहीनः। आकाशवदित्यव्यावृत्तः। यन्मूर्तं न भवति तदनित्यं न भवति, यथाकाशमिति विपरीतव्यावृत्तः। अत्राप्यन्त्यौ वचनदोषौ। एते षड्वैधर्म्योदाहरणाभासा इति। अन्ये तु सन्देहमुखेनापरानष्टावुदाहरणाभासान् दर्शयन्ति। सन्दिग्धसाध्यो यथा—महाराज्यं करिष्यत्येष राजपुत्रः, रसेम[सोम]वंश्यत्वात्, विवक्षितराजपुत्रवत्। सन्दिग्धसाधनो यथा—नायं सर्वज्ञः,रागादिमत्त्वात्, अद्यागतपान्थपुरुषवत्। सन्दिग्धोभयो यथा—गमिष्यति स्वर्गं विवक्षितः पुरुषः, समुपार्जितशुक्लधर्मत्वात्, अद्यागतापरिचितपुरुषवत्। सन्दिग्धाश्रयो यथा—नायं सर्वज्ञः, बहुवक्तृत्वात्, भविष्यद्देवपुत्रवत्। सन्दिग्धसाध्यव्यावृत्तो यथा—माहा[?]यो महाराज्यं न करिष्यति, स सोमवंश्यो न भवति, यथान्यो राजपुत्रः। सन्दिग्धसाधनव्यावृत्तो यथा—यः सर्वज्ञः स रागादिसहितः, यथा समस्तशास्त्रार्थज्ञः पुरुषः। सन्दिग्धोभयव्यावृत्तो यथा—यस्स्वर्गं न गमिष्यति स समुपार्जितशुक्लधर्मापि न भवति, दुष्टपुरुषवत्। सन्दिग्धाश्रयो यथा—सस्सर्वज्ञः स बहुवक्तापि न भवति, भविष्यद्देवपुत्रवत्॥

दृष्टान्ते प्रसिद्धाविनाभावस्य साधनस्य दृष्टान्तोपमानेन पक्षे व्याप्तिव्यापकं वचनमुपनयः। यथा[तथा] चेदं दृश्यं जागरितमिति साधर्म्योपनयः, तथादृश्यं न भवति इदं जागरितमिति वैधर्म्योपनयः॥

उपनयानन्तरं सहेतुकं प्रतिज्ञायाः पुनर्वचनं निगमनम्। तस्मान्मिथ्यैव जागरितमिति। न चेदमसाधनाङ्गं निगमनम्, विपक्षे बाधकप्रमाणसद्भावसूचकत्वादस्य। न च विपक्षे बाधकमन्तरेण साध्यावधारणं संभवति; तथा चोक्तम् "विमृश्य पक्षप्रतिपक्षाभ्यामर्थावधारणं निर्णयः" इति। पक्षप्रतिपक्षाभ्यामिति साधनदूषणाभ्यामित्यर्थः। तस्मान्निगमनप्रतिपाद्यार्थसद्भावादस्ति निगमनम्। ब्रह्मवित्समये निगमनं नास्तीति चेन्न, यत आह—

"हेतूक्तितः प्रतिज्ञायाः सिद्धार्थाया यदुत्तरम्।
वचो निगमनं तत् स्याद्वाक्यस्यावयवोऽन्तभाक्॥" इति।

भाष्यकारोऽप्याह "निगमनस्थानीयं मैत्रेयीब्राह्मणम्" इत्यादि। ततः शाबरमपि भाष्यमुपनयनिगमनसद्भावं सूचयति। "ननु सर्व एव निरालम्बनः प्रत्ययः; प्रत्ययस्य हि निरालम्बनतास्वभाव उपलक्षितः स्वप्ने। जाग्रतोऽपि स्तम्भ इति वा कुड्य इति वा प्रत्ययापेक्षा भवति। तस्मात् सोऽपि निरालम्बन एव" इति निदर्शनात्। स एष परमो न्यायः यद्विप्रतिपन्नं पुरुषं प्रति पञ्चावयवं वाक्यम्। तत्सापेक्षं परार्थानुमानम्। एवं स्वार्थं परार्थं च द्विविधमनुमानम्॥

"विशेषेऽनुगमाभावः सामान्ये सिद्धसाध्यता" इति चार्वाकस्य यः पर्यनुयोगः, सोऽग्निधूमजात्याक्रान्ताकारेण व्यक्त्योरेव व्याप्यव्यापकभावाभ्युपगमेन गम्यगमकभावाभ्युगमाच्च निरस्तः ॥

अन्ये पुनः प्रत्यक्षपूर्वकं त्रिविधमनुमानमाहुः—पूर्ववत्, शेषवत्, सामान्यतोदृष्टं चेति । तत्र पूर्ववत्—पूर्वं कारणम् ; पूर्वमस्यास्तीति पूर्ववत्, कारणवदित्येतत् ; कारणेन कार्यानुमानम्—यथा विशिष्टमेघोन्नतिदर्शनाद् भविष्यति वृष्टिरिति । शेषवत् कार्यवत्; शेषोऽस्यास्तीति शेषवत् ; उक्तात्कारणादन्येन शेषेण कार्येण कारणानुमानम्—यथा नदीपूरविशेषादभूद् वृष्टिरिति । कार्यकारणयोरन्यतरदर्शनादन्यतरप्रतिपत्तिः सामान्यतोदृष्टम्—यथा सवितुरुदयगिरिमूर्धनि दृष्टस्यास्तगिरिमस्तके दर्शनाद् व्रज्यानुमानम् । तथा च मनुरस्यानुमानत्रयस्य सद्भावं दर्शयति, प्राप्तिपूर्वकत्वात् प्रतिषेधस्य—

" आसीदिदं तमोभूतमप्रज्ञातमलक्षणम् ।
अप्रतर्क्यमविज्ञेयं प्रसुप्तमिव सर्वतः ॥" इति ॥

अत्राप्रज्ञातमिति प्रत्यक्षप्रतिषेधः । अलक्षणमिति पूर्ववदनुमाननिषेधः । अप्रतर्क्यमिति शेषवदनुमाननिषेधः । अविज्ञेयमिति सामान्यतोदृष्टनिषेधः । एतच्चानुमानत्रयं व्याप्तिबलात् ॥

अत्राह—का पुनरियं व्याप्तिः? किंच तस्यां प्रमाणम्? उच्यते । व्याप्तिरविनाभावः; अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ च तस्यां प्रमाणम् । कः पुनरविनाभावः—अग्निस्वरूपम्, आहोस्विद्धूमस्वरूपम्, अथवा तयोः कार्यकारणभावः, किं वा तत्त्वान्तरम्? यदा तत्त्वान्तरं तदापि किं स्वतन्त्रम्, उत तदाश्रयम्? यदा तदाश्रयम्, तदापि किमग्न्याश्रयम् , उत धूमाश्रयम् , आहोस्विदुभयाश्रयम्—इति विकल्पः । अन्वयव्यतिरेकावपि किं प्रत्यक्षान्तर्भूतौ, आहोस्विदनुमानान्तर्भूतौ, अथवार्थापत्त्यात्मकौ—इति तत्रापि विकल्पः । उच्यते । धूमाश्रय एव कश्चिद्धर्मोऽविनाभाव इति वदामः । स च नात्यन्तमभिन्नः, नाप्यत्यन्तं भिन्नः, किंतु तदात्मक एव कश्चिन्नियमविशेषः, तथा प्रतीतेः । न चैतयोः कार्यकारणभावोऽस्य धूमैकनिष्ठत्वात् , कार्यकारणभावस्य चोभयनिष्ठत्वात् ; तस्मात्तत्त्वान्तरमविनाभावः । न च स्वतन्त्रः, नाप्युभयतन्त्रः, धूमैकतन्त्रत्वात् ; अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ च तत्र प्रमाणम् , प्रत्यक्षान्तर्भूतावनुमानान्तर्भूतावर्थापत्त्यन्तर्भूतौ वा विरोधाभावात् । प्रत्यक्षान्तर्भावपक्षे भूयोदर्शनसंस्कारसहितार्थेन्द्रियसंप्रयोगाद्व्याप्तिविज्ञानोत्पत्तिरिति योजयितव्यम् ; वैशेषिकादिवत् अन्वयव्यतिरेकयोर्मानसप्रत्यक्षान्तर्भावानभ्युपगमात् । अन्यथासिद्धिप्रयोजकसंशयावन्वयव्यतिरेकदूषणम् ; तदभावे तयोरौत्सर्गिकं प्रामाण्यमनपवादं भवति प्रत्यक्षान्तर्भावपक्षे । अर्थैव[अर्थाप]-

स्यन्तर्भावपक्षे पुनरन्यथासिद्धार्[व]र्थापत्तिरेव नास्तीति प्रापकाभावादेव कार्याभावः, न प्रतिबन्धकसद्भावात् । अनुमानत्वपक्षेऽप्यनन्यथासिद्धावेवान्वयव्यतिरेकौ व्याप्त्यादि-लिङ्गमिति व्याप्त्याभावादेव व्याप्तिज्ञानलक्षणकार्याभावः,न प्रतिबन्धकसद्भावात्। अन्यथा-सिद्धिर्यथाग्निसामीप्यात् पाषाणधूमयोः ; क्वचित् तत्तन्त्रत्वाद् यथा धूमपैङ्गल्ययोः; क्वचिदेककारणकार्यत्वाद् यथा भस्मधूमयोः ; कार्यकारणत्वाद् यथा पितामहपौत्रयोः; क्वचित्कारणेन समानाश्रयत्वात् अकारणस्य कार्यान्वयव्यतिरेकयोरन्यथासिद्धिः, यथा गुरुत्वात्, पाषाणस्य पतने पाषाणगतरूपादिना तदीयपतनान्वयव्यतिरेकयोः ; क्वचित्कारणप्रतिबन्धकाभावत्वाद् तस्य कार्येण सहान्वयव्यतिरेकयोरन्यथासिद्धिः, यथा मणिमन्त्राद्यभावस्य धूमेन सह। क्वचित्प्रतिबन्धकत्वात् तस्य कार्येण सह अन्वयव्यतिरे-कयोरन्यथासिद्धिः, यथा प्रतिमन्त्रस्य धूमेन सहेति । एवंप्रकारमप्यूह्यं प्रयोजकसंशयस्यो-दाहरणम् ॥

मन्त्रार्थवादानामन्यपरत्वात् विषभक्षणादिवाक्यवद्यथाश्रुतेऽर्थे न प्रामाण्यमिति मीमांसकेनोक्ते वेदान्तवाद्याह—सन्दिग्धं प्रयोजकम् ; किं प्रमाणान्तरेण बाधाद्विषभक्षणा-दिवाक्यस्य यथाश्रुतेऽर्थेऽप्रामाण्यम्, आहोस्विदन्यपरत्वाद् इति । तदेवमन्यथासिद्धि-प्रयोजकसंशयाभावेऽन्वयव्यतिरेकौ व्याप्त्यादिग्रहणनिमित्तमिति सिद्धम् । अतोऽनु-मानात्मकत्वमेवान्वयव्यतिरेकयोरस्मद्दर्शने । कस्मात्? आप्तवचनात् । तथाहि भगवत्पा-दीयवचनम्—

"अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ हि पदार्थस्य पदस्य च ।
स्यादेतदहमित्यत्र युक्तिरेवावधारणा ॥" इति ।

युक्तिरत्रानुमानलक्षणा, न पुनस्तर्कः ; अन्यत्रान्वयव्यतिरेकयोः स्पष्टमनुमान-शब्दौ[ब्द]निर्देशात् ; तथाह्यन्वयव्यतिरेकौ प्रकृत्याह—

"अनुमानप्रदीपेन हित्वा सर्वाननात्मनः ।
संसारैकावलम्बिन्या तदभावं धियेप्सति ॥"

इति **वार्तिककारः** । तस्मादुपपन्नं व्याप्तिग्रहणम् ॥

अत्र केचिदाहुः । त्रिरूपाणि त्रीण्येव लिङ्गानि—अनुपलब्धिः स्वभावः कार्यं चेति । परार्थानुमानवाक्यं च हेतूदाहरणावयवद्वयात्मकमिच्छन्ति । तेषां स्वार्थानुमानं तावदुपन्यस्यते—त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गादर्थदृक् स्वार्थानुमानम् । तत्रापि प्रथममनुपलब्धिः यथा—न प्रदेशविशेषे क्वचिद् घट उपलब्धिलक्षणप्राप्तस्यानुपलब्धेरिति । स्वभावस्यो-दाहरणं यथा—वृक्षोऽयं शिंशपात्वादिति। कार्यस्योदाहरणं यथा—अग्निरत्र धूमादिति । अत्र द्वे वस्तुसद्भावसाधने स्वभावः कार्यं चेति ; अनुपलब्धिस्तु प्रतिषेधहेतुः । इति स्वार्थानुमानम् ॥

अथ परार्थानुमानम्—त्रिरूपलिङ्गाख्यानं परार्थानुमानं कारणे कार्योपचारात् । तद् द्विविधं प्रयोगभेदाद्, साधर्म्यवत् वैधर्म्यवच्च । नानयोरर्थतः कश्चिद्भेदः, अन्यत्र प्रयोगभेदात् ; तत्र साधर्म्यवत् ; यदुपलब्धिलक्षणप्राप्तं सन्नोपलभ्यते तदसत् ; यथा—

खरस्य विषाणम्; नोपलभ्यते च क्वचिदेव प्रदेशविशेष उपलब्धिलक्षणप्राप्तो घट इत्यनुपलब्धिप्रयोगः। तथा स्वभावहेतोः प्रयोगः—यत्सत् तत्सर्वमनित्यम्, यथा घटादि; सच्च विवादास्पदीभूतमिति। तथा यदुत्पत्तिमत् तदनित्यम्, यथा घटादि; उत्पत्तिमच्च विवादास्पदीभूतमिति। तथा यत्कृतकं तदनित्यम्, यथा घटादि; कृतकं च विवादास्पदीभूतमिति। कार्यहेतोः प्रयोगः; यत्र धूमस्तत्राग्निः यथा महानसादौ; अस्ति चेह धूम इति। वैधर्म्यवतः प्रयोगः; यत्सदु[यदु]पलब्धिलक्षणप्राप्तं तदुपलभ्य इति, [प्राप्तं तदुपलभ्यते तत् सत्] यथा नीलादिविशेषः; न चैवमिहोपलब्धिलक्षणप्राप्तस्य घटस्योपलब्धिरित्येषोऽनुपलब्धिप्रयोगः। नित्ये नास्ति सत्त्वमुत्पत्तिमत्त्वं कृतकत्वं वा। असंश्च [संश्च] शब्द उत्पत्तिमान् कृतको वेति वैधर्म्यवतः स्वभावहेतोरेव प्रयोगः। असत्यग्नौ न भवत्येव धूमः। अत्र चास्तीति कार्यहेतोर्वैधर्म्यवतः प्रयोगः। तदेतदसत्; स्वभावादित्रयविलक्षणस्य कृत्तिकोदयस्य रोहिण्युदयलिङ्गत्वदर्शनात्। न हि कृत्तिकोदयो रोहिण्युदयस्य स्वभावः; नापि कार्यम्; नाप्यनुपलब्धिः; प्रमाणाभावात्; तथापि कृत्तिकोदयो रोहिण्युदयस्य लिङ्गं दृश्यते; तस्मादेव न त्रीण्येव लिङ्गानीति। त्रिरूपाण्येवेति एतदप्यसत्, पाञ्चरूप्यचातूरूप्ययोर्दर्शितत्वात्। परार्थानुमानवाक्यस्य द्व्यवयवनियमाभ्युपगमोऽप्यनुपपन्नः, पञ्चावयवत्वदर्शनात्। तस्मादन्येन[तस्मात् येन]प्राप्तं पञ्चरूपं चतूरूपं वा। तत्तु लिङ्गमिति नियमः; न त्रयं चतुष्टयं वेति। परार्थानुमानवाक्यं च पञ्चावयवमिति स्थितम्॥

केचित्पुनर्वेदान्तपक्षेऽपि त्रिरूपमेव लिङ्गं त्र्यवयवं च वाक्यमिच्छन्ति। त्रिरूपत्वे लिङ्गस्य ज्योतिर्ब्राह्मणगतं **सुरेश्वरस्य** वार्तिकं गमकमाहुः—

> "सहोपलम्भसंस्कारात् पुनर्द्वीर्येकदर्शनात्।
> सानुमासंभवस्तत्र व्यभिचाराय चेन्न हि॥" इति।

त्र्यवयवत्वं च वाक्यस्य, कर्ममीमांसावार्तिककारपरित्यागे कारणाभावादिति। तथा सति असिद्धविरुद्धानैकान्तिकसप्रतिसाधनाश्चत्वार एव हेत्वाभासाः। प्रकरणसमस्य सप्रतिसाधनेऽन्तर्भावः, अनध्यवसितस्य चानैकान्तिकेऽन्तर्भावः; प्रत्यक्षाविरुद्धत्वादि प्रतिज्ञादोषो न हेतुदोषः; ततश्च कालात्ययापदिष्टो नाम हेत्वाभासो नास्ति, कालात्ययापदिष्टस्यानध्यवसितवदनैकान्तिकेऽन्तर्भावात्; किंतु षट् प्रतिज्ञाभासाः—प्रात्यक्षविरुद्धः, अनुमानविरुद्धः, शास्त्रविरुद्धः, अर्थापत्तिविरुद्धः, योग्यानुपलब्धिविरुद्धः, अनुभवविरुद्धश्चेति। अत्र च पक्षे केवलान्वयिनोऽन्वयव्यतिरेकिमध्येऽन्तर्भावोऽपि [वः वि] पक्षाभावादेव विपक्षाद्व्यावृत्तेर्व्यतिरेकसद्भावात्। केवलव्यतिरेकिणो गमकत्वमेव नास्ति "सहोपलम्भसंस्कारात् पुनर्धीर्येकदर्शनात्" इत्यनुमानलक्षणविधानात्। कथं पुनर्वेदान्तग्रन्थेष्वापीत [वांत] हेतुप्राचुर्यदर्शनम्? बाह्यतार्किकमुखपिधानार्थं नैयायिकपक्षप्रसिद्धव्यतिरेकहेत्वङ्गीकरणवादेन तदुपन्यासात् तत्प्राचुर्यदर्शनमित्यस्मिन् पक्षे योजयितव्यमित्यलं प्रसङ्गेन। तस्मादनुमानमपि न व्यभिचरति॥

॥ अनुमानलक्षणं समाप्तम्॥

THE QUEST OF SĪTĀ

A CRITICAL STUDY OF VĀLMĪKI'S TECHNIQUE.

R. NARAYANA AIYAR, I.C.S. (*Retd.*).

In the Saṅkṣepa Rāmāyana we read

ततो गृध्रस्य वचनात्संपातेर्हनुमान्बली ।
शतयोजनविस्तीर्णं पुप्लुवे लवणार्णवम् ॥

I. i. 70

and 'sampātivacana' is frequently referred to[1] as the means by which the vānaras who followed Angada in quest of Sītā learnt that she was immured in Laṅkā. Now Sampāti, that mighty eagle, was known to Rāma as elder brother to Jaṭāyu. He was probably not unknown to Sugrīva who seemed to be aware of everything in the world, barring Rāvaṇa's lurking-place!—cf. कथं भवान्विजानीते सर्वं वै मण्डलं भुवः (IV. xlvi. 1). And yet, neither in his instructions to Aṅgada nor in those to the commanders despatched to the other three quarters, did Sugrīva mention Sampāti as one whom they might perhaps come across. Nor in their search of the 'Vindhya' and 'Malaya' ranges did Aṅgada and his host discover him, thorough though their search of the region was, and stationary though the great bird was in that region. Sampāti in the epic is a *deus ex machina* whom the Poet hoists on to the stage when the vānaras were in a desperate plight, and their great leaders, Jāmbavān, Hanumān and the rest were at the end of their resources and altogether bankrupt of counsel. As his name imports, Sampāti just *happened* (from Sam+Pat to happen); his appearance in the nick of time to solve their difficulties was a pure accident. Chance had played a part in Rāma's history before; but the Poet had displayed the train of events in its wake as controlled by the hero's strong character and purposive conduct, for instance when

1. I. iii. 26; V, xiii. 5, 53; xxxi-14; xxxv. 62-63, 67; VI. cxxix. 43.

ज्ञातिदासी यतोजाता कैकेय्यास्तु सहोषिता ।
प्रासादं चन्द्रसंकाशमारुरोह यदृच्छया ॥

II. vii. 1

and when

तथाऽऽसीनस्य रामस्य कथासंसक्तचेतसः ।
तं देशं राक्षसी काचिदाजगाम यदृच्छया ॥

III. xvii. 7

with momentous consequences, in the former case his exile from the kingdom स्त्रीतृतीयं च्युतं राज्याद्धर्मकामं च केवलम् VI. cxxvii. 5, as Bharadvājā put it; in the latter case the mortal enmity of Rāvaṇa leading to Rāma's separation from his beloved. In the vital matter of the tracing of the abducted heroine to Laṅkā, however, instead of exhibiting it as due to the hero's superior virtues or valour or to the skill and resource of his divinely-appointed monkey ally and his agents, the Poet has attributed it to sheer chance and made the story of her recovery hang and turn on this hinge. Not only does this strike one as incongruous, but there is also a certain air of unreality in the circumstances under which Sampāti 'happened' in the history. When Rāma retired to Prasravaṇagiri after the vānaras had been despatched on their quest, he had a right to expect that Aṅgada's party would rapidly complete the search of the mountain ranges and caves and river valleys in the south and get to the Southern Ocean where

सिद्धचारणसङ्घैश्च प्रकीर्णं सुमनोहरम् ।
तमुपैति सहस्राक्षः सदा पर्वसु पर्वसु ॥

IV. xli. 23

a spot renowned in our Tamil literature as 'குரங்கு செய்கடற் குமரியம் பெருந்துறை'[1], and that Hanuman would lose no time in crossing to Laṅkā. Their actual proceedings were very different. They lost themselves in the mazes of the Vindhya and the Malaya, विचेतव्यप्रदेशेषु बहुषु विद्यमानेषु, as the learned commentator points out (IV. l. 4). The leaders including Hanumān displayed no consciousness of the supreme and solemn charge that had been laid on them to search Rāvaṇa's abode,

---

1. Maṇimekhalai, ch. 5-'the lovely holy bathing ghat of Kanyākumari where lies the sea on which the monkeys did work'. *see* M. Raghava Aiyangar, ஆராய்ச்சித் தொகுதி, p. 30.

Lañkā, above all other places. I suggest that it did not suit the Poet's purpose as a literary artist that Hanumān should find Sītā before the month was out, *i.e.*, by the end of Pouṣa or indeed till towards the end of the period of exile, *i.e.* Phālguna. Hence the double search of the same region

अद्यापि तद्वनं दुर्गं विचिन्वन्तु वनौकसः ।
खेदं त्यक्त्वा पुनः सर्वैर्वनमेतद्विचीयताम् ॥

IV. xlix. 7

Hence that ṛkṣabila episode, which reads too much like a tale out of the Arabian Nights or out of those fabulous and incredible ramblings of Ulysses into which the genius of Homer ebbed and eddied in the decline of its vigour, and which has no organic connection with the main action and was obviously interposed to fill up time. Hence the amusing but rather unconvincing prāyopaveśana scene. Hence finally the Sampāti episode.

That episode one is inclined at first to dismiss as beset with manifest improbability and not altogether indispensable for the framework of the Poem considered as a work of art. But it is with the Rāmāyaṇa as with Mathematics. "*Allez en avant,*" said a great French mathematician, "*et la foi vous viendra*"—'Get along and the faith will come to you!' 'Every mathematical book that is worth anything must be read backwards and forwards,' was his advice. By constant musing I struck a line of thought which I proceed to develop.

To deal first with the *time factor* referred to above, the scheme of Vālmīki's story required that Sītā should remain Rāvaṇa's captive for a twelvemonth, and that her restoration to Rāma after a comparatively short campaign—really a punitive expedition, daṇḍayātrā—should be followed at its heels by the restoration of the kingdom to him. The Poet, having made his hero and heroine traverse the length of the forest on foot, मां चाप्यरण्यं नयतः पदातिम्, V, xxxvi. 29, designed for his climax a splendid and spectacular aerial voyage for them in a celestial car. He had to time their return to the capital to occur in the same glorious and auspicious month of Chaitra which Daśaratha had chosen for the coronation fourteen years before.

चैत्रः श्रीमानयं मासः पुण्यः पुष्पितकाननः ।
यौवराज्याय रामस्य सर्वमेवोपकल्प्यताम् ॥

II. iii. 4

and not a day sooner or later than Rāma had promised to Bharata.

> चतुर्दशे हि संपूर्णे वर्षेऽहनि रघूत्तम ।
> न द्रक्ष्यामि यदि त्वां तु प्रवेक्ष्यामि हुताशनम् ॥
> तथेति च प्रतिज्ञाय....
> अनेन धर्मशीलेन वनात्प्रत्यागतः पुनः ।
> भ्रात्रा सह भविष्यामि पृथिव्याः पतिरुत्तमः ॥

II. cxii. 25, 26; cxi. 31

Between the hero's re-union with the lost heroine and his reinstatement in the lost kingdom no event of secondary importance must be interposed, such, for instance, as the installation of[1] Vibhīṣaṇa; nor must any stretch of time intervene which Rāma, who was under a vow (IV. xxvi. 9) not to enter villages or townships during the exile, would perforce have to pass in the forest. For the Poet to remit him after his stupendous achievements to 'tarumūlas' (foot of trees) in Daṇḍaka, there to resume his penitential exercises and await the expiration of the time fixed by Kaikeyī, were it acceptable even to her, would be sheer bathos. As we should expect in a great epic, Vālmīki attains to the sublime at the 'exitus' (end), and by what Greek rhetoricians called 'auxesis' [2], a series of magnificent incidents, heaped one upon another, ascending by a continued gradation to a summit of grandeur[3], or, as Sanskrit rhetoricians say, of the 'adbhuta rasa' or marvellous sentiment, which should characterize the close of a mahākāvya, गोपुच्छाग्ररीत्या, [4] crowding surprises in the manner of the bush at the end of a cow's tail.

---

1. The Poet who compares the coronation of Rāma, VI. cxxxi 62, and of Sugrīva, IV. xxvi. 35, to that of Indra by the eight Vasus, omits, not without significance, the phrase 'वसवो वासवं यथा' in his description of Vibhīṣaṇa's coronation, VI. cxv. 14, 15.

2. 'Auxesis'—Lat. incrementum, an ascending towards a climax; 'Amplification'.

3. Longinus on the Sublime, Pt. I, sect. xi.

4. ' कार्यं गोपुच्छाग्रं कर्तव्यं काव्यबन्धमासाद्य ।
ये चोदात्ता भावाः ते सर्वे पृष्ठतः कार्याः ॥
सर्वेषां काव्यानां नानारसभावयुक्तियुक्तानाम् ।
निर्वहणे कर्तव्यो नित्यं हि रसोऽद्भुतस्तज्ज्ञैः ॥

Bharata's Nāṭya Śāstra, xx. 46, 47.

I am indebted to Dr. Raghavan for this reference.

So we have, in final solution of all problems and complications in the Plot, a quick succession of marvels and thrills—the vanquishing of Rāvaṇa, the crowning of Vibhīṣaṇa, Sītā's ordeal by fire, the descent of the gods and their intercession, the re-union of the hero and the heroine, the advent of Daśaratha and the revocation of his dread curse on Kaikeyī and Bharata, the return to Ayodhyā by the Puṣpaka, and the re-union with Bharata, all culminating in the resplendent coronation of the hero and the heroine[1]. From the artistic standpoint, therefore, it was essential that these mighty events should occur towards the close of the period of exile.

At the same time, the exigencies of the seasons, and the customs by which princes regulated the conduct of their military expeditions demanded that the search for Sītā should be organized in the autumn as soon as the rains had ceased, that is to say, some five months before the exile was due to end

त्रिजिगीषूणां कण्टकान् समुद्धतुं शरत्काले समुद्योगः ।[2]

Cf. यात्रायै चोदयामास तं शक्तेः प्रथमं शरत् ॥

Raghuvamśa, iv. 24.

Accordingly we find Rāma telling Sugrīva to bestir himself for the punitive expedition against Rāvaṇa towards the end of Āśvayuja—

कार्तिके समनुप्राप्ते त्वं रावणवधे यत ।

IV. xxvi. 16.

The vast numbers required for the search were got together towards the end of the autumnal season, *i.e.*, in Mārgaśīrṣa; and though there were still some four months of exile, we find that Sugrīva restricted the operations of the search gangs to one month. For this limiting of time there

---

1. I. iii. 37, 38.
2. *Cf.* वनस्पतीनां सरसां नदीनां तेजस्विनां कान्तिभृतां दिशां च ।
 निर्याय तस्याः स पुरः समन्ताच्छ्रियं दधानां शरदं ददर्श ॥
 Bhaṭṭikāvya, 28. (II. 1)

 'शरदुपगमकाले संत्यजन्योगनिद्रां शरणमुपगतानां त्राणहेतोः प्रयास्यन् ।'
 Deśika: Pādukāsahasram, xi, 41 (301).

 'रक्षार्थमाश्रितजनस्य समुज्जिहाने रङ्गेश्वरे शरदि शेषभुजङ्गतल्पात् ।'
 ib. xiv. 39 (419).

was a compelling reason. An army marches on its belly. Supplies of food in the regions to be traversed might be precarious and in any case were not to be depended upon. The only land flowing with milk and honey mentioned by Sugrīva was Vaidyuta in the farthest south (IV. xli. 33-4), and that region the vānaras never had to go to. It was out of the question to attach a commissariat to search parties which had to cover incredible distances and move rapidly; the raids which the monkeys made on the stores would for one thing have depleted them in no time. The Poet gives us an indication how Sugrīva and his commander-in-chief, Nīla, solved the problem. We are told (IV. xxix. 30) that at Sugrīva's command Nīla had despatched his generals to different quarters to assemble the vānara forces, that those who went to the north came upon edible roots and fruits in an ancient sacrificial ground in the Himālayas which had the rare and inestimable property of appeasing hunger for a whole month, and that they garnered them and brought them to Sugrīva (IV. xxxvii. 27-37).

तदन्नसंभवं दिव्यं फलं मूलं मनोहरम् ।
यः कश्चित्सकृदश्नाति मासं भवति तर्पितः ॥ ३० ॥

To Nīla who had to feed crores and crores of monkeys this was manna, and we may be sure that it was an immense store that the commanders brought of the precious food. Nīla and Aṅgada would distribute the rations to the four great armies before they set out on their quest, and, as they were warranted to render the monkeys immune from hunger for a month, Sugrīva wisely planned that they must return before they should feel its pangs. There was a notable difference, however, in the orders he issued to the commanders on this point. To Vinata who was despatched to the east the order ran:

मासे पूर्णे निवर्तध्वमुदयं प्राप्य पर्वतम् ॥
ऊर्ध्वं मासान्न वस्तव्यं वसन्वध्यो भवेन्मम ।
सिद्धार्थाः सन्निवर्तध्वमधिगम्य च मैथिलीम् ॥

IV. xl. 67-8.

Similarly to Suṣeṇa who was sent to the west:

अस्तपर्वतमासाद्य पूर्णे मासे निवर्तत ।
ऊर्ध्वं मासान्न वस्तव्यं वसन्वध्यो भवेन्मम ॥

IV. xlii. 50.

These chiefs could reckon the days by the sun and would have little difficulty in obeying the stern order—sugrīvājña being synonymous with sternness—that they should on pain of death return at the end of a month. Śatabali who was deputed to the north would not see the sun in the extreme north, it being the winter solstice; nevertheless the region will be bright with the light of the golden Soma mountain situate in the middle of Lavaṇasamudra, and as it would be impossible to tell night from day, the monkeys would lose count of time. Sugrīva therefore directed that Śatabali should retrace his steps as soon as he sighted Somagiri. Virtually this order was the same as that given to Vinata and Suṣeṇa, with this difference that he stood to incur no penalty if he happened to be late by a few days. The order to the southern command however was very different. Aṅgada, unless he had to visit the farthest south, was in no danger of losing count of days like Śatabali (though he grew oblivious of the passage of time in the magic cave), and yet he was not peremptorily required to return from his search at the end of the month. In place of the order that whoever tarried beyond the month should be summarily executed, Sugrīva announced that whoever returned from the south within the month and reported that Sītā had been seen would deserve well of him and should receive gifts, and rewards and great honour from him.

[1] यस्तु मासान्निवृत्तोऽग्रे दृष्टा सीतेति वक्ष्यति ।
मत्तुल्यविभवो भोगैः सुखं स विहरिष्यति ॥

IV. xli. 48.

The party that proceeded to the south was not expected to accomplish its purpose within the time limit; there were therefore to be no pains and penalties. The difference in the terms of Sugrīva's command is significant because it reveals the Poet's design that the return of Aṅgada and Hanumān should be put off to the approach of spring. This involved two difficulties. One was that Rāma whose grief waxed with every day of separation from Sītā—

1. It was Sugrīva that coined the famous auspicious phrase दृष्टा सीता with its inverted order of words which Hanumān greeted Rāma with:

न्यवेदयदमेयात्मा दृष्टा सीतेति तत्त्वतः I. i. 76.

[1] शोकश्च किल कालेन गच्छता ह्यपगच्छति ।
मम चापश्यतः कान्तामहन्यहनि वर्धते ॥

VI. v. 4,

would grow impatient of the delay and might come to doubt the success of Sugrīva's plans. By way of meeting this the Poet represents the commanders who punctually returned at the end of the month from the east, west and north as assuring Sugrīva and Rāma not only that Sītā was not in any of those quarters but that Hanumān who had gone to the south would see her.

उदारसत्त्वाभिजनो महात्मा स मैथिलीं द्रक्ष्यति वानरेन्द्रः ।
दिशं तु यामेव गता तु सीता तामास्थितो वायुसुतो हनूमान् ॥

IV. xlvii. 14.

Now their word by itself would carry little conviction. Rāvaṇa was capable of hiding himself and Sītā where no one could get at them, as Sītā herself warned Hanumān

अथवाऽऽदाय रक्षांसि न्यसेयुः संवृते हि माम् ।
यत्र ते नाभिजानीयुर्हरयो नापि राघवौ ॥

V. xxxvii. 58.

He might carry Sītā with him for instance and lurk in the ocean-depths or in the nether regions as Valin said—

न्यस्तां सागरतोये वा पाताले वाऽपि मैथिलीम्

IV. xvii. 51,

or, as Lakṣmaṇa picturesquely put it, in Aditi's womb—

यदि यात्यदितेर्गर्भं रावणः सह सीतया ।
तत्राप्येनं हनिष्यामि न चेद्दास्यति मैथिलीम् ॥

IV. i. 121.

How could the Vānara chiefs be so cock-sure then that Sītā would be found in the southern quarter? That they were not giving utterance to a pious hope or an idle prophecy is evident from the fact that Rāma suffered the further delay of two months, Pouṣa and Māgha, *see* Gov. on IV. liii. 21-5, without repining, and was content to abide the return of Hanumān with equanimity. We hear no more vilāpa from him till after

1. *Cf.* 'கழியமிக்கதோர் காதல்' Tiruvaimozhi, 5-5-10.

Hanumān brought news of Sītā, when the pangs seized him once more and he burst out in lamentation to Lakṣmaṇa—

न मे दुःखं प्रिया दूरे ; वाहि वात यत कान्ता ; कदा नु चारुबिंबोष्ठं
and so forth.

VI. v. 5 ff.

Its eems very probable that the assurance given by Vinata, Suṣeṇa and Śatabali was inspired. For, Sugrīva had specially commissioned his father-in-law, Suṣeṇa, that when he reached the remote west he should wait upon the holy ṛṣi, Merusāvarṇi, and *ask* him for news of Sītā—

[1] प्रष्टव्यो मेरुसावर्णिर्महर्षिः सूर्यसन्निभः ।
प्रणम्य शिरसा भूमौ प्रवृत्तिं मैथिलीं प्रति ॥

IV. xlii. 47

and we may well suppose that while the great sage would hardly impart details known to him through yoga, he told Suṣeṇa in general terms that all was well with Sītā and that the search in the south whither Hanumān had gone with credentials would be blessed with success. The second difficulty was that by tarrying beyond the month Aṅgada's party would outstep the divine sustenance they had partaken of, and would find themselves in grave peril of starvation. This however suited the Poet's purpose very well as he could introduce Sampāti. It would not indeed sort with his design if the hunger-stricken monkeys made prāyopaveśana soon after the expiry of Pauṣa; so he contrived that they should sojourn for several weeks in the ṛkṣabila enjoying the sumptuous hospitality of Svayamprabhā, and emerge from the cave only at the approach of spring.

---

1. Quaere: Is this the Merusāvarni whom Svayamprabhā mentions as her father in IV. li. 16? Some think that Svayamprabhā who was hostess to the monkeys was no other than Śāndilī mentioned in the Mahābhārata verse—

शृङ्गाणि वै शृङ्गवतस्त्रीण्येव मनुजाधिप ॥....
सर्वरत्नमयं चैकं भवनैरुपशोभितम् ।
तत्र स्वयंप्रभा देवी नित्यं वसति शाण्डिली ॥

Bhīṣma, viii. 9

ततः पुष्पातिभाराग्राँल्लताशतसमावृतान् ।
द्रुमान्वासान्तिकान्दृष्ट्वा बभूवुर्भयशङ्किताः ॥
ते वसन्तमनुप्राप्तं प्रतिबुद्ध्वा परस्परम् ।
नष्टसन्देशकालार्था निपेतुर्धरणीतले ॥
मासः पूर्णो बिलस्थानां हरयः किं न बुध्यते ॥

IV. liii. 20, 21, 24

By means, then, of the discovery of precious foods in the foot-hills of the Himālayas, and by means of enduing them with the virtue of giving sustenance for a month, the Poet has contrived skilfully to dovetail the parts of his story into one another. He devised that the members of the most important of the search parties should outstrip that sustenance, and famishing seek food and water in a dark cave where they should tarry unmindful of time, and that their situation when they came out of it should be so desperate that he could bring in Sampāti to revive their drooping spirits with news of Sītā. The three other parties should meanwhile have returned to Kiṣkindhā to cheer Rāma up with the firm hope of Hanumān's successful accomplishment of his mission. As Hanuman said—

मय्यगच्छति चेहस्थे धर्मात्मानौ महारथौ ।
आशया तौ धरिष्येते वानराश्च मनस्विनः ।

V. xiii. 39

but their message helped Rama await his return with composure.

But why Sampāti at all? This question leads us to a consideration of the other factors that determined the course of the search for Sītā, and we shall proceed to analyse them. Sītāparimārgaṇa was incomparably the most stupendous task set to man or monkey. Jaṭāyu likened it to a search for a potent herb in the forest.

यामोषधिमिवायुष्मन्नन्वेषसि महावने ।

III. lxvii. 15

He was referring only to the search in Daṇḍaka, but it very soon became apparent to Rāma that the area to be combed was much wider, indeed conterminous with the earth as known to the most eminent geographer that flourished in that age, Sugrīva. (It falls here to be noted that if we are to appreciate Vālmīki's poem we must not quarrel with Sugrīva's geography;

we do not let Milton's cosmogony interfere with our enjoyment of *Paradise Lost.*) 'Rāvaṇālaya' to which Danu had said Sugrīva would go in quest of Sīta—

स यास्यति वरारोहां निर्मलां रावणालये ।

III. lxxii. 25

was known to Sugrīva (IV. xli. 24-5). Rāvaṇa's 'nilaya' in the sense of 'lurking-place' was not known. As Tilaka explaining the word in

तत्र सीतां च वैदेहीं निलयं रावणस्य च ।

IV. xl. 18.

points out,

निलयं रावणस्य निलयं स्थानम् । यद्वा चतुर्दिक्षु रावणवासस्थानमनेन सूचितम् ।

This was *Factor Number One* in the problem, and as we shall see the least troublesome factor.

Lakṣmaṇa had suggested that Rāma could secure the help of the Maharṣis to find out where Sītā had been hidden by her captor—

येन राजन्हृता सीता तमन्वेषितुमर्हसि ।
मद्द्वितीयो धनुष्पाणिः सहायैः परमर्षिभिः ॥

III. lxv. 12

and this seemed very feasible as the holy ascetics by the exercise of their yogic powers would have been able to tell Rāma where Sītā was (*e.g.*, Bharadvāja who told Rāma

सर्वं च सुखदुःखं ते विदितं मम राघव ।
सर्वं ममैतद्विदितं तपसा धर्मवत्सल ॥

VI. cxxvii. 9, 16,)

Rāma however never looked to these great men to extricate him from his difficulties or to do for him what he felt his own tapas and his own strong right arm ought to achieve. Did he not tell Śarabhaṅga and Sutīkṣṇa for instance

अहमेवाहरिष्यामि स्वयं लोकान्महामुने ।

III, v, 33; vii. 14

In the words of Bhāravī,

लघयन्खलु तेजसा जगन्न महानिच्छति भूतिमन्यतः ।

Kirātārjunīya, ii. 18.

Take this very matter of Rāvaṇa's permanent address. Rāma was ignorant of it, and till Rāvaṇa carried Sītā off did not seem curious about it, notwithstanding that Viśvāmitra had mentioned him to Daśaratha at the very beginning of the history

श्रूयते हि महावीर्यो रावणो राक्षसाधिपः ।

I. xx. 19;

notwithstanding again that Sūrpaṇakhā had pointedly told Rāma

रावणो नाम मे भ्राता बलीयान् राक्षसेश्वरः ।
वीरो विश्रवसः पुत्रो यदि ते श्रोत्रमागतः ॥
प्रख्यातवीर्यौ च रणे भ्रातरौ खरदूषणौ ।

III. xvii. 23, 25.

He implored Jaṭāyu when he had breathed his last, ब्रूहि ब्रूहि (III. lxviii. 17) as the dying man's kinsmen in the Āzhvār's stanza importune him for the whereabouts of the hidden hoard and of unknown debtors

'சோர்வினாற்பொருள் வைத்ததுண்டாகிற் சொல்லு
சொல்லென்று சுற்றுமிருந்து
ஆர்வினவிலும் வாய்திறவாதே யந்தகால
மடைவதன் முன்னம்'

Periāzhvār-tirumozhi, 4. 5. 3.

Foiled in his attempt to get Jaṭāyu to finish his sentence about Rāvaṇa's abode, Rāma told Danu

नाममात्रं तु जानामि न रूपं तस्य रक्षसः ।
निवासं वा प्रभावं वा वयं तस्य न विद्महे ॥

III. lxxi. 22

and later asked Sugrīva

क्व वा वसति तद्रक्षो महद्व्यसनदं मम ।

IV. vi. 25

If Rāvaṇa heard that, he might well exclaim with Satan, 'Not to know me argues yourselves unknown'; on a like occasion he laughed in the face of Marutta and said—

अकुतूहलभावेन प्रीतोऽस्मि तव पार्थिव ।
धनदस्यानुजं यो मां नावगच्छसि रावणम् ॥
त्रिषु लोकेषु कोऽन्योऽस्ति यो न जानाति मे बलम् ।
भ्रातरं येन निर्जित्य विमानमिदमाहृतम् ॥

VII. xviii. 9-10.

Indeed it is one of the puzzles in the poem that Rāma who could not have been ignorant of Kubera as the regent of the northern quarter had not heard of Rāvaṇa as ruling in Laṅkā. Might it be that as his hero could destroy the three worlds by his own might

त्रैलोक्यं तु करिष्यामि संयुक्तं कालधर्मणा ।
नाशयामि जगत्सर्वं त्रैलोक्यं सचराचरम् ॥

III. lxiv. 63, 72

the Poet thought that he must keep him ignorant of Rāvaṇa's abode as he would otherwise burn Laṅkā up with his arrows even from where he was, and force Rāvaṇa to come to him, which would hardly suit his poem? The learned commentator advances this view which we must take for what it is worth—

तद्वासमात्रज्ञाने तद्गमने स स्वयमेव इह आगमिष्यति इति हि रामाभिप्रायः ।

Govindarāja on IV. vii. 2-3

Need Rāma have remained ignorant of the simple fact of Rāvaṇa's residence of which he had ample opportunities of informing himself? He could have known it from Kulapati who first told him of the misdeeds of 'a certain Khara, younger brother of Rāvaṇa' (II. cxvi. 11), from the ascetics who welcomed him into Daṇḍaka and sought his protection (III. i. 16-20); from the ṛṣis of the āśramamaṇḍala among whom he lived for ten years (III. xi. 24-28); or from the maharṣis who came to congratulate him on his victory over Khara, Dūṣaṇa and their four and ten thousand followers (III. xxx. 38). None of these seem to have mentioned to Rāma that Rāvaṇa the arch-enemy held sway in Laṅkā; and Rāma, we have to suppose, was incurious or was reluctant to ask the great men anything that they did not choose to tell him themselves. He *asked* Viśvāmitra where Mārīca and Subāhu perpetrated their atrocities, because he had been engaged to put an end to them. It would be time enough to ask where Rāvaṇa was when Rāma had any quarrel to settle with him. Whether after Sītā was carried off, the paramarṣis if applied to as suggested by Lakṣmaṇa for information about Rāvaṇa would have been particularly communicative may admit of some doubt. If Damayantī's experience on a similar occasion can be taken as a guide, Rāma would have had little enlightenment from them as to *where* Sītā was held a prisoner. Damatyanī asked ṛṣis in the āśramamaṇḍala about the puṇyaśloka—

कच्चिद्भगवतां रम्यं तपोवनमिदं नृपः ।
भवेत्प्राप्तो नलो नाम निषधानां जनाधिपः ॥

The answer she got was simply—

पतिमेष्यसि कल्याणि कल्याणाभिजनं नृपम् ॥

And then the holy men vanished with their sacrificial fires and their dwelling huts.

एवमुक्त्वा नलस्येष्टां महिषीं पार्थिवात्मजाम् ।
अन्तर्हितास्तापसास्ते साग्निहोत्राश्रमास्तथा ॥

Mahābhārata, Vana, lxi. 86, 94-5

Even if Rāma was disposed to solicit the help of the sages for ascertaining Sītā's whereabouts, the Poet obviated all necessity for Rāma to go out of his way to seek them by planting Danu Kabandha right athwart his path. Danu imparted to Rāma his divine knowledge of the means, and the only means, by which he could find out and recover Sītā, *viz*, friendship with Sugrīva, with the sacred fire to witness the compact.

अद्रोहाय समागम्य दीप्यमाने विभावसौ ।

III. lxxii. 17

What Danu said was convincing in details and definitive in import, and if Rāma entertained any doubt as to the divine nature of the guidance he received, it was set at rest not only by Danu's rise to the skies in his sight, but particularly by Śabarī's ascent to the abodes of the blest after she had seen Rāma, as had been foretold by Danu. We can best understand the role for which the Poet meant to cast Danu by considering it in relation to Lakṣmaṇa's advice about seeking the help of paramarṣis. Any help which the latter gave would of its very nature be gratuitous; the help that Danu proffered was in return for the supreme service rendered by Rama in faithfully incinerating Danu's huge body which was possible to no other mortal—

तच्छरीरं कबन्धस्य घृतपिण्डोपमं महत् ।
मेदसा पच्यमानस्य मन्दं दहति पावकः ॥

III. lxxii. 3

and delivering him from his age-long curse. This was more in accord with the character of the hero who had declared न हि वर्ते प्रतिग्रहे (II. l. 43). The ṛṣis again would have give

Rāma their blessing and assured him of eventual success; Danu gave him practical guidance and present help. The Poet describes Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa as सुप्रीतौ (III. lxxiii. 44); and Rāma, if he ever entertained the idea of tracing Rāvaṇa's abode by himself and of destroying it in order to compel Rāvaṇa to appear before him, gave it up and decided implicitly to follow the guidance that the gods by means of Danu had vouchsafed him.

अभित्वरे च तं द्रष्टुं सुग्रीवं वानरर्षभम् ।
तदधीनं हि मे सौम्य सीतायाः परिमार्गणम् ॥

III. lxxv. 9

The search for Sītā, then, was not only to be world-wide as we saw, but was to be carried out solely by monkeys under the orders of Sugrīva. This was *Factor Number Two.*

Sugrīva literally had crores of monkeys at his disposal for this business.

शलभा इव संछाद्य मेदिनीं संप्रतस्थिरे ।

IV. xlv. 2

is how the Poet describes them. When Sugrīva had had them mustered (IV. xxxix. 45), he organised the search in four divisions which he assigned to the four quarters. To the divisional commanders he gave minute instructions, but gave also ample liberty to exercise their own discretion as circumstances might dictate

अतोऽन्यदपि यत्कार्यं कार्यस्यास्य हितं भवेत् ।
संप्रधार्य भवद्भिश्च देशकालार्थसंहितम् ॥

IV. xlii. 55

The general orders, besides the time limit already mentioned, were—

सर्वमाशु विचेतव्यं कपिभिः कामरूपिभिः ।

IV. xlii. 17

रावणः सह वैदेह्या मार्गितव्यस्ततस्ततः ॥

IV. xl. 31, 60, 63; xlii. 45

अधिगम्य तु वैदेहीं निलयं रावणस्य च ।

IV. xl. 67; xlii. 50

One injunction was particularly important. Each division was to be an indivisible unit. This is remarkable. Aṅgada, as we know from Hanumān's report to Sītā, had set out with no less than a third of the entire vānara forces, त्रिभागबलसंवृतः V. xxxv. 56. It was not open to him to break his huge army corps up into separate brigades and to assign different tracts to them with a common rendezvous, or to depute, say, Hanumān with a powerful contingent to search Laṅkā and the other islands. The search in every region was to be conducted by all the vānaras of the division *together*. This indeed sorted very well with the habits of monkeys who were accustomed to move about in troops. Accordingly we find—

विचित्य दिवसं सर्वे सीताधिगमने धृताः ।
समायान्ति स्म मेदिन्यां निशाकालेषु वानराः ॥

IV. xlvii. 4

again,

मार्गध्वं सहिताः सर्वे रामपत्नीं यशस्विनीम् ॥

IV. xl. 29

ते विचित्य पुनः खिन्ना विनिष्पत्य समागताः ।
एकान्ते वृक्षमूले तु निषेदुर्दीनमानसाः ॥

IV. xlviii. 23

also,

तत्र वायुसुतः सर्वे विचिनोति स्म पर्वतम् ।
परस्परेण हनुमानन्योन्यस्याविदूरतः ॥

IV. l. 5

Monkeys being gregarious by nature, why, it may be asked, did Sugrīva insist that they should conduct their search सहिताः and समागताः, i.e. संघीभूताः ? Two reasons may be suggested. Once the monkey gangs got separated, they would wander about aimlessly in search not of Sītā but of one another !

नित्यमस्थिरचित्ता हि कपयो हरिपुङ्गव ।

IV. liv. 9

अनेकचित्ताः was how Rāvaṇa characterised them (VI. xxiv. 27) They were quite capable of forgetting their quest! Did not even their great leaders lose sight of it in Svayamprabhā's cave? Another reason perhaps is this. What Sugrīva had ordered for this business of search was a *levee en masse*, of able-bodied monkeys indeed, but of varying quality. There

were no cowards among them; Rāma, like the great commander he was, magnanimously offered on the eve of the war to excuse those from service who did not feel equal to it.

> यच्च फल्गु बलं किंचित्तदत्रैवोपयुज्यताम् ।
> एतद्धि कृत्यं घोरं नो विक्रमेण प्रयुध्यताम् ॥

VI. iv. 14

which reminds us of King Henry's speech on the eve of Agincourt—

> "He which hath no stomach to this fight,
> Let him depart; his passport shall be made
> And crowns for convoy put into his purse."

Henry V, IV. iii. 35

But among the rank and file were these—

> ये प्रसक्ताश्च कामेषु दीर्घसूत्राश्च वानराः ।
> इहानयस्व तान्सर्वाञ्शीघ्रं तु मम शासनात् ॥

IV. xxxvii. 11

We have all met with these dilatory individuals and know them well; they are चिरक्रियाः , procrastinators, उद्योगं कुर्वाणा इव कालयापकाः We have all a sneaking fondness for them; they are the men in our public offices to whom we used to give an extension year after year after they had attained their fifty-fifth year, and whom nowadays we 're-employ' after retirement! It was incumbent upon the divisional commanders that these dīrgha-sūtras were not left behind on any account. 'நொண்டி ஆடு வந்துதான் படல் சாத்த வேணும்' , as we say in Tamil. One wonders why they were allowed to hamper the search at all, for it is they that must have set the pace in a service in which everything while it had to be done thoroughly had to be done rapidly as well, आशु आशु. Perhaps there was some solid merit in them. Perhaps they were more thorough and reliable than the common run of monkeys who must have been flighty. Perhaps also the Poet meant us to understand that Rāmakaiṅkarya embraced all and that there was no question of excluding anybody as belonging to the category of tāmasakartā. "They also serve who stand and wait." This, then, was *Factor Number Three*, viz. that the search for Sītā, conditioned as it was by Factors one and Two, was *mass work* in the first instance.

"In the first instance," because, in the first stage of the search the monkeys could only be expected to find a *likely* person, a beautiful woman well guarded in her captivity who was *most probably Sītā.* Sītā's identity was not known to the vānaras. Beautiful women were to be found in all parts of the world, and the vānaras might easily mistake one of them for Sītā. Was it not perhaps strikingly and comically to illustrate this difficulty that the Poet makes the intelligent Hanumān himself dance in an ecstasy of joy when he took Maṇḍodarī to be Sītā ?

आस्फोटयामास चुचुम्ब पुच्छं ननन्द चिक्रीड जगौ जगाम ।
स्तम्भानरोहन्निपपात भूमौ निदर्शयन्स्वां प्रकृतिं कपीनाम् ॥

V. x. 55

Or, Rāvaṇa who knew a hundred magical arts

ततोऽपधार्य मायानां शतमेकं समासवान् ।

VII. xxiii. 16

might create a māyāsītā for the benefit of inquisitive monkeys; was not Hanumān, again,—even he who had seen and spoken with Sītā—deceived by one such on the battle-field?

त्यक्त्वा प्राणान्विचेष्टन्तो रामप्रियचिकीर्षवः ।
यन्निमित्तं हि युध्यामो हता सा जनकात्मजा ॥

IV. lxxxii. 22

cf.

यत्कृतेऽरीन्व्यगृह्णीम समुद्रमतराम च ।
सा हतेति वदन्नाममुपातिष्ठन्मरुत्सुतः ॥

Bhaṭṭikāvya, xvii. 23

The supreme and almost insuperable difficulty for the vānara leaders was, how to establish the identity of Sītā when they imagined they had found her. Suppose for instance that the eastern division came upon a fair captive in a cave in Udayagiri, Vinata could hardly present himself before her at the head of his troop of monkeys and address her, like H.M. Stanley, "Sītā Devī I presume?" It was his own identity he would have to establish in the first instance, and for this purpose he would have to go back to Kiṣkindhā to fetch his credentials! From the wonderful technique which Hanumān invented for himself we know that the search in its second stage, that is, the establishment of Sītā's identity, the

inducing of confidence in her, the holding of converse with her, the administering of solace to her, aud the exchange of tokens, abhijñānas, with her, was work of a very delicate character calling for the highest qualities of head and heart. It is not for nothing that the Poet has consecrated a whole kāṇḍa exclusively to Hanumān, though 'to a European taste,' in Griffith's words, the Sundara 'is the most intolerably tedious of the whole poem.' For an aesthetic appreciation of Sundarakāṇḍa it is not necessary to defend every line of it, to applaud every sentiment, to extol every simile; it is the *tout ensemble* that matters, and that is, that the story of Hanumān finding Sītā is something rich and rare. Not to speak of the priceless picture of night-rangers' life and manners which the Poet lets us see through the eyes of the 'laṅkā-praveśa-nava-nātaka-sūtradhāra' who raised the curtain over Laṅkā for just one night, he has shown us step by step from his monkey-hero's own lips how he went to work to find Sītā. It is hardly to be expected that a mind that is not *en rapport* with Hanumān's nirveda can sympathise with his finer feelings— ममापि व्यथितं मनः (V. xvi. 28), मम च प्रवणं मनः (V. lix. 2), or appreciate the beauty of 'the long and useless speeches' which in the eyes of the Western scholar 'impede the action of the poem.' This however by the way. What we are concerned with here is that the search for Sītā in the second stage was definitely not mass work but *individual work*, and work that required a high order of intellect and the utmost skill and circumspection. This was *Factor Number Four.*

Bearing these factors of the problem in mind, especially Factors Three and Four, that is, that the effective search for Sītā had to be carried out in *two stages*, the first by mass work and the second by individual work, let us see what Aṅgada's party could have done to carry out Sugrīva's command to search Laṅkā in particular.

द्वीपस्तस्यापरे पारे शतयोजनमायतः ।
अगम्यो मानुषैर्दीप्तस्तं मार्गध्वं समन्ततः ॥
तत्र सर्वात्मना सीता मार्गितव्या विशेषतः ।
स हि देशस्तु वध्यस्य रावणस्य दुरात्मनः ॥ IV. xli. 24-5

We shall assume that after searching the mainland the party had reached the shore of the southern sea well within the time limited by Sugrīva, that they had *not* met Sampāti, and that they

knew nothing of him. Their task was plain. Firstly, they had to cross to Laṅkā by air, in a body, and go over the island, a hundred yojanas in extent, सहिताः *i.e.* संघीभूताः, all together, with a tooth-comb, to find a fair captive answering to the description of Sītā. Secondly, they had to establish her identity and exchange tokens with her. Of these two stages, the second, *viz.* all that related to holding converse with Sītā, was individual work, work of an extremely difficult and delicate character that a multitude was unfitted for and that could properly be performed only by an individual member of the party. Such an individual the party possessed in Hanumān. Him had Sugrīva singled out for this part of the task—

> तद्यथा लभ्यते सीता तत्त्वमेवोपपादय ॥
> त्वय्येव हनुमन्नस्ति बलं बुद्धिः पराक्रमः ।
> देशकालानुवृत्तिश्च नयश्च नयपण्डित ॥

IV. xliv. 6-7

and to him had Rāma entrusted the credentials—

> ददौ तस्य ततः प्रीतः स्वनामाङ्कोपशोभितम् ।
> अङ्गुलीयमभिज्ञानं राजपुत्र्याः परंतपः ॥
> अनेन त्वां हरिश्रेष्ठ चिह्नेन जनकात्मजा ।
> मत्सकाशादनुप्राप्तमनुद्विग्नानुपश्यति ॥

IV. xliv. 12-3

But what about the first stage of sītā-parimārgaṇa that had to precede it, *viz.* the discovery of a person answering to the description of Sītā, in Laṅkā? That was mass work. Was that practicable? It was carried out elsewhere, though with a negative result. It fact, Sītānveṣaṇa by the eastern, western, and southern divisions, the commanders of which had *not* been equipped with any credentials, conveniently came to an end with the first stage! But was it possible for the southern division to undertake the first stage of the search in Laṅkā, Rāvaṇa's own abode?

In the first place, for Aṅgada and his contingent of troops —a third of the entire vānara forces of Sugrīva, as we pointed out—to have invaded Laṅkā in a body to look for Sītā would have meant *war* with Rāvaṇa. Hanumān as a solitary intruder was, as we know, looked upon as but a spy, and Rāvaṇa deemed it beneath his dignity to take any notice of him; but even Hanumān had to fight in self-defence—

ततस्ते राक्षसाः प्राप्ता बलिनो युद्धकाङ्क्षिणः ।
रक्षणार्थं तु देहस्य प्रतियुद्धा मया रणे ॥

V. 1-15

How would Rāvaṇa have brooked an invasion by a host of monkeys? War was the certain result of such an invasion. The issue of such a war was uncertain. Even if the monkeys won, Rāvaṇa might baulk them of their object by hiding Sītā away where she could not be found. Rāma-kārya on which they had embarked might suffer serious if not irreparable damage. Rāma's reputation as the hero of Janasthāna would assuredly suffer hurt by this warfare of the monkeys. Above all, from the Poet's point of view, the artistic unity of the heroic poem would be marred by the tale of a ridiculous preliminary war between monkeys and rākṣasas in which the hero and the villain, the kāvya-nāyaka and pratināyaka, had no part.

Secondly, *could* Aṅgada and his army have invaded Laṅkā by air in a body? Sugrīva no doubt sent his generals with commissions to cross seas of vast distances. But while he meticulously informed them of the distances between various points to be touched in their voyages, he never mentioned to Aṅgada *how far* Laṅkā was from Mahendragiri. He only said that Laṅkā itself extended over a hundred yojanas, and for the rest told him that when he got to the shore of the southern sea, he and his advisers should decide for themselves what they had to do!

ततः समुद्रमासाद्य संप्रधार्यार्थनिश्चयम् ।

IV. xli. 20

It was from Sampāti, later, that Aṅgada and his party learnt that Laṅkā was fully a hundred yojanas off.

इतो द्वीपः समुद्रस्य संपूर्णे शतयोजने ।

IV. lviii. 20

No vānaras except Sugrīva himself, Vālin, Jāmbavān, 'calidus juventa,' in his 'hot youth', and Hanumān in his infancy had so far achieved such a long flight. The Poet has preserved for us the entries for this 'Long Jump Competition' (IV. lxv.), and we find that barring Aṅgada and Hanumān there was not one member of the party that could jump across to Laṅkā. In fact we have it from Hanumān that four individuals alone in the monkey world were capable of the feat—

चतुर्णामेव हि गतिर्वानराणां महात्मनाम् ।
वालिपुत्रस्य नीलस्य मम राज्ञश्च धीमतः ॥

V. ii. 30

though he names a few others in V. iii. 15-6.

So far as Laṅkā and the islands beyond were concerned, therefore, it was simply out of the question for the vānaras of Aṅgada's party to carry out systematically, and in a body, the *first stage of the* search as prescribed by Sugrīva, though they were well equipped to carry it out in its second stage. While the other three great divisions after a rapid yet thorough search of the east, west, and north, including the islands in those regions of the world, were able to report that Sītā was *not* to be found there, the southern division could not invade Laṅkā in a body without provoking a war, even if they could jump the intervening expanse of sea, and had thus no means whatever of finding out *whether Sītā was in the island or no.* Some means they had if they had applied to Agastya whom Sugrīva had directed them to visit at his seat on the top of Malaya to receive the sage's blessing.

तस्यासीनं नगस्याग्रे मलयस्य महौजसम् ।
द्रक्ष्यथादित्यसंकाशमगस्त्यमृषिसत्तमम् ॥
ततस्तेनाभ्यनुज्ञाताः प्रसन्नेन महात्मना ।

IV. xli. 16-17

The Poet who narrates the adventures of the southern party, as he does not of the other three parties, makes no mention of Aṅgada having met Agastya. The sage of course had more than one seat in the south, *e.g.* on the Kuñjara mountain (IV. xli. 35), and it is reasonable to suppose that he was away from Malaya when Aṅgada got to it. Of what use, then, would it be for Hanumān alone to go to Laṅkā on the off-chance of finding Sītā there? That was not what Sugrīva had contemplated. Suppose Sītā was not in Laṅkā but had been hidden away by Rāvaṇa in some rocky island fastness in the southern ocean, for instance, Puṣpitaka, a hundred yojanas on the other side of Laṅkā as Sugrīva had been careful to state, Sūryavān, fourteen yojanas beyond that, Vaidyuta further beyond, Kuñjara mentioned above, or the famed and impregnable city of Bhogavatī still further beyond, or Ṛṣabha guarded by the Rohitas right at the back of beyond, on the very confines

of Pitṛloka in fact, was Hanumān to visit these places in succession by himself, or was he to return to Mahendragiri from Laṅkā and report his unsuccess to Aṅgada and Jāmbavān? Hanumān himself was quite clear in his mind what he would do in such a contingency. On no account would he return to the mainland to report failure:—

सोऽहं नैव गमिष्यामि किष्किन्धां नगरीमितः ।
न च शक्ष्याम्यहं द्रष्टुं सुग्रीवं मैथिलीं विना ॥
मध्यगच्छति चेहस्थे धर्मात्मानौ महारथौ ।
आशया तौ धरिष्येते वानराश्च मनस्विनः ॥
सागरानूपजे देशे बहुमूलफलोदके ।
चितां कृत्वा प्रवेक्ष्यामि समिद्धमरणीसुतम् ॥

V. xiii. 38-9, 41

Presumably Hanumān would search the other islands by himself. Sugrīva's orders however were that Aṅgada should search all these islands *with* his followers till Sītā was found. Why, he had made the monkeys' mouths water, describing the joys of food and drink they were to regale themselves with in Vaidyuta island!

सर्वकामफलैर्वृक्षैः सर्वकालमनोहरैः ॥
तत्र भुक्त्वा वरार्हाणि मूलानि च फलानि च ।
मधूनि पीत्वा मुख्यानि परं गच्छत वानराः ॥

IV. xli. 33-4

How were they going to do it when they were incapable of taking the initial hop to Laṅkā?

It appears, then, that there was a grave lacuna in Sugrīva's plans for the search in Laṅkā and beyond. When after searching the mainland Aṅgada's band of vānaras found themselves on the shores of the southern sea, they would be faced with the formidable fact that while Hanumān and their leader[1] could

---

[1] Jāmbavān, 'the Odysseus of the expedition of Lanka' (De Gubernatis) would not let Angada, the Crown Prince, take the leap to Laṅkā

(भवान्कलत्रमस्माकं स्वामिभावे व्यवस्थितः ।
स्वामी कलत्रं सैन्यस्य गतिरेषा परंतप ॥
तस्मात्कलत्रवत्तात प्रतिपाल्यः सदा भवान् ।
and so forth, IV. lxv. 23ff.),

jump to Laṅkā the distance was too great for the main body's powers. This is to say, while the second stage of Sītānveṣaṇa in Laṅkā or in the islands beyond, which was *individual work, could* be carried out, it was simply impossible to accomplish the first stage which was an essential preliminary and was *mass work*.

Perhaps the lacuna was not unintentional. If we may make so bold as to take a peep into the Poet's workshop, we may perhaps find him thinking aloud somewhat in this strain:—" I cannot have a war—a ridiculous minor war between monkeys and demons—in Laṅkā without my hero, what will my kāvya look like? Any attempt therefore to make a search *en masse in Laṅkā* I must rigorously exclude. I will even make it impossible for any except the indispensable Hanumān with the signet ring to take the jump at all!" This line of thought will help us to see that that the considerations suggested above, *viz.* (i) the interests of Rāmakārya and the Mahākāvya, and (ii) the inability of the monkeys to jump to Laṅkā, are really interrelated and not independent.

To proceed with the main argument, suppose now that the party had met Agastya on Malaya peak, that Aṅgada had *asked* him for news of Sītā (Sugrīva had *not* bidden him ask, as he had expressly bidden Suṣeṇa ask Merusāvarṇi), and that the sage had told him that Sītā was in Laṅkā, the search for Sītā would at once be removed to the second stage and the matter simplified at one stroke. For, all that would remain to be done was for Hanumān to cross over with the credentials with which he had been equipped, use his intelligence to pick Sītā out, give Rāma's message and ring to her and bring back her cūḍāmaṇi and message. But just as for literary reasons the Poet felt bound to avoid a preliminary conflict in Laṅkā following its invasion by monkeys in a body, he would seem to have felt it incumbent upon him, consistently with the sentiments of his hero, to exclude all help from Agastya in the business of search.

---

any more than Lord Kitchener would sanction the Prince of Wales's going to the Front in the Great War, and for reasons similar to what Lord Kitchener gave, *viz.*, that it might not matter two pence if the Prince was annihilated by a German shell, but that he could not take any responsibility if he should fall into the hands of the Boche!

Here let us take another peep into the Poet's sanctum. *The Poet*: "Sugrīva of course must warn Aṅgada not to omit to pay his respects to Agastya when he searches the precincts of Malaya. But Rāma who has always refrained from troubling the holy men of Daṇḍaka with his affairs would not wish the sage to be applied to for a mere item of news as to Sītā's whereabouts. I must leave the Great One to come himself, when the time is ripe, hailing

राम राम महाबाहो शृणु गुह्यं सनातनम् ।

VI. cvii, 3

The monkeys must have no audience of him now; they shall therefore not find him in his seat in Malaya. Very well. But the next point is, that as I have made search in Laṅkā *en masse* out of the question and *impossible*, I must even make it *unnecessary*. I have made Sītānveṣaṇa by the other three divisions *end* with the first stage, *viz.*, the search *en masse*, for which alone they were equipped. I shall contrive means by which the search *in Laṅkā* may *begin* from the second stage, for which the southern division alone is equipped. To enable Aṅgada to dispense with the first stage, *viz.*, the search in a body ordered by Sugrīva, he shall have the assurance of an *eye-witness* that *Rāvaṇa and Sītā are actually in Rāvaṇa's house in Laṅkā*. Now, who so well-adapted for my purpose as a son of Vinatā's race, endued with keen sight with a range of a hundred yojanas? But he must not be a bird of passage, here to-day and gone to-morrow, or Aṅgada might not meet him except by a lucky accident. Let me see. Jaṭāyu, Śyenīputra, is dead, but his elder brother, Sampāti, whom Jaṭāyu had mentioned to Rāma (III. xiv. 33), and who he no doubt believed had been burnt up in that mad race of the brothers with the sun (IV. lviii. 4ff.), is still alive. He had burnt his wings, which is perhaps just as well, as by reason of it he is now stationary in his eyrie on Vindhya looking out on the southern ocean. He shall serve for a telescope. I will contrive that the vānaras shall resort to the vicinity of this 'observatory' in Vindhya. At the meeting with them Sampāti shall complete to Aṅgada the tale 'left half-told' to Rāma by Jaṭāyu with his last breath—

पुत्रो विश्रवसः साक्षाद्भ्राता वैश्रवणस्य च ।

III. lxviii. 16; and IV. lviii. 19

अध्यास्ते नगरीं लङ्कां रावणो नाम राक्षसः ॥

IV, lviii. 19

He shall testify to what he actually saw even while he was speaking

इतो द्वीपः समुद्रस्य संपूर्णे शतयोजने ।
तस्मिँल्लङ्कापुरी रम्या निर्मिता विश्वकर्मणा ॥
तस्यां वसति वैदेही दीना कौशेयवासिनी ।
रावणान्तःपुरे रुद्धा राक्षसीभिः सुरक्षिता ॥
इहस्थोऽहं प्रपश्यामि रावणं जानकीं तथा ।

IV. lviii. *20, 22, 29*

And for his Rāmakaiṅkarya

वाङ्मात्रेण तु रामस्य करिष्ये साह्यमुत्तमम् ॥

IV. lviii. 12

Sampāti shall, in fulfilment of an ancient prophecy of Sage Niśākara, there and then regain his wings by a miracle occurring before the very eyes of the vānaras, so that he might say to Jāmbavān—to adapt the words of Maināka to Hanumān (Campū, Sundara, 5)— तस्मात्पूर्वं विपक्षोऽपि सपक्ष इति मां भज—and Jāmbavān and Aṅgada and Hanumān might be assured of the truth of Sampāti's testimony. The romantic tale I have in mind of Svayamprabhā's cave of illusion where the vānaras shall forget their quest and lose count of time shall show that indiscretion sometimes serves us well!"

Sampāti-vacana, then, did exactly what the imaginary Agastya-vacana would have accomplished, that is, informed Aṅgada and the other leaders that Sītā was of a surety in Laṅkā. This was of tremendous significance. It decisively dispensed with the first stage of Sītā-parimārgana *in* Laṅkā, *i.e.*, with the necessity for the search party to go in a body to look if Sītā was in Laṅkā or not; and as that stage has been shown to be impossible of execution, the search which by reason thereof might have languished on the hither side of the ocean received a fresh impetus. At the same time it did not do away with the second stage, as was made clear by Hanumān

संपातिवचनाच्चापि रामं यद्यानयाम्यहम् ।
अपश्यन्राघवो भार्यां निर्दहेत्सर्ववानरान् ॥

V. xiii. 53

It enabled the great vānara leaders, thanks to their indiscretion, to proceed at once with the second stage, *viz.*, the meeting of Sītā face to face and the exchange of messages and abhijñānas which it was possible for an individual member of the party and only for him to accomplish.

Such seems to be the true import of 'Sampāti-vacana'. If Sampāti was not real—and Brahma's words

न ते वागनृता काव्ये काचिदत्र भविष्यति ।

I. ii. 35

preclude the idea—he was *ben trovato.*

ON A MEANING OF THE WORD KAUŚIKA

BY

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH.D.

In Artha Śāstra XI. i. (p, 380, Mysore II edn.), on Saṅghavṛtta or affairs of the republics of merchants (vārttopajīvins), soldiers (śastropajīvins) and others assuming the title of king (Rājaśabdopajīvins), Kauṭilya has occasion to speak of methods employed to create split or to do away secretly with unwanted persons; and among persons who could be easily employed for such plots, Kauṭilya mentions many classes of men and woman engaged in artistic and other persuits and moving closely with those in power as part of their retinue. We find here the following—

कौशिकस्त्रियो नर्तकी गायना वा प्रतिपन्नान् गूढवेश्मसु रात्रिसमागमप्रविष्टाः तीक्ष्णाः हन्युर्बध्वा हरेयुर्वा ।

(p. 380)

The danseuse and the songstress here are clearly understood, but who are the *Kauśika-striyaḥ* of the same category whom Kauṭilya mentions here?

Mm. Dr. Shama Sastri translates Kauśika-striyaḥ as harlots (p. 439 of his English translation); but this meaning, conjectured on the basis of the sense of the context, seems to be too wide of the mark.

Mm. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri reads the text here as अदितिकौशिकस्त्रियः in his edition of the Artha Śāstra in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, and gives the following explanation in his commentary:

अदितयो नानादेवालेख्यप्रदर्शनवृत्तयः स्त्रियः । कौशिकस्त्रियः व्यालग्राहिस्त्रियश्च ।

That is, Aditi-strī is a woman going about exhibiting pictures of several deities[1] and Kauśika-strī, a woman snake-charmer.

---

[1] On Picture-Showmen in Ancient India, *See* Coomaraswam *IHQ*. V. 182-187; my note, *IHQ* XII. p. 524.

The reading *Aditi-kauśika-striyaḥ* is the one adopted by Mādhavayajvan in his Nayacandrikā on the Artha Śāstra; but the meaning given by Mādhavayajvan is not in complete agreement with Mm. Ganapati Sastri's.

" अदितिकौशिकस्त्रियः इति । अदितिकौशिकदेवतालेख्यध्वजेन भिक्षमाणानां योगपुरुषाणां....... ।"

Madras Ms. R. No. 2403. p. 233.
Lahore edn. p. 208.

Though, unfortunately, there is a gap in the text of the Nayacandrikā here, we can make out Mādhavayajvan's idea; according to him, both Aditi and Kauśika refer to pictures of deities of those names and the women meant here by Kauṭilya are wives of Yogapuruṣas or secret agents in the guise of beggers carrying these pictures of deities and begging alms. But how such beggars could get private engagements in secret places during nights with the persons they have planned to do away with or carry away is really difficult to understand.

It appears to me that the reading in XI. i Aditi-kauśika-striyaḥ' adopted by Mādhavayajvan is an instance of an erroneous repetition, and that the correct reading here is 'Kauśikastriyaḥ' without the word Aditi, as found in the Mysore edn. The earlier passage on which this wrong repetition in XI. i. is likely to be based occurs in I. xvi, Rājaputra-rakṣaṇa, where we find

" तस्मान् मातृबन्धुषु वासः श्रेयान् इति । 'ध्वजस्थानमेतद्' इति । तेन हि ध्वजेन अदितिकौशिकवदस्य मातृबान्धवा भिक्षेरन् ।

p. 33. Mysore 2nd edn,

Kauṭilya is discussing in this chapter the question of the bringing up of the prince who is the next claimant to the throne and is likely to develop enmity towards his own father. Different writers suggest different places where he could be sent away to be brought up by others, and the defect of each suggestion is pointed out. One suggestion is that the prince may be left with his mother's kinsmen but, as against this suggestion, it is said that the mother's relatives may use him as a pretext to beg of the king monies for themselves; and as an analogy for such begging, the text mentions here 'Aditi-kauśika' as beggars using '*Dhvaja*'. What this Dhvaja is we do not know

exactly. When Mādhavayajvan came upon, in the later context in XI. i., the expression 'Kauśika-striyaḥ', his mind at once remembered the earlier passage in I. xvi 'Dhvajena Aditi-Kauśikavad Bhikṣeran' and he made out the sense in the light of that earlier passage, namely that the words Aditi, Kauśika, and Dhvaja, signified banners painted with deities and exhibited by beggars while asking for alms. The text itself in XI, i must have been changed wrongly into *Aditi*—Kauśika-striyaḥ on the basis of the earlier Aditi-kauśikavat.

On the earlier passage unfortunately we do not have the commentary of Mādhavayajvan; but we have the Jayamaṅgalā on this portion of the text, and it is to the Jayamaṅgalā that Mm. Ganapati Sastri owes his interpretation of Aditi as picture showing beggar and Kauśika as snake-charmer.[1] The Jayamaṅgalā says here :

" *अदितिकौशिकवत्* । यो देवताप्रतिमा....याभिक्षणं कुर्यादित्यदितिरुच्यते । कौशिकोऽहितुण्डिकः व्यालग्राहिक इत्यर्थः । तदुभयमपि देवतामहिं च ध्वजीकृत्य नादानाभ्यां तत्प्रसादकोपादिशन् (?) लोकं भिक्षेत ।

Madras Ms. R. 5208, p. *79.*

According to this commentary, Aditi alone exhibits a figure of god while begging; Kauśika is a snake-charmer; the point in mentioning two kinds of beggars is that the mother's relatives who use the prince to extract gifts from the royal exchequer may adopt a peaceful method of request like the god-exhibiting Aditi or frighten the king to part with gifts like a snake-charmer using a snake. As the expression Dhvaja, in this interpretation, is common to both varieties of begging, we have to understand by Kauṭilya's *Dhvaja* no painted banner, but only 'pretext' which is an accepted meaning of that word; even in the case of Aditi, it is doubtful if any painted banner is meant, for the Jayamaṅgalā uses only the expression 'Devatā-pratimā.' 'Snake-charmer' is one of the well-known meanings of the word Kauśika given by lexicons.[2] As Mādhvayajvan's

[1] Dr. Shama Sastri does not translate the words Aditi and Kauśika here !

[2] Some lexicons give among the several meanings of the word Kauśika, Vyālagrāhi or snake-charmer, and also the meaning Nakula or ichneumon. Probably the first alone, snake-catcher

interpretation simply works upon the words *Dhvaja* and *Bhikṣā* in the earlier passage, and as there is no agreement between him and the author of the Jayamaṅgalā, and as, according to my suggestion, the addition of the word Aditi to Kauśika-striyaḥ in XI. i may be an accretion due to Aditi-kauśikavat in I. xvi, we might try to seek independently for any other reasonable and relevant meaning of the word Kauśika in Kauṭilya XI. i.

As observed already, it is somewhat difficult to understand how such beggars could have occassion to enjoy the private company of important persons. In the drama Mudrārākṣasa, we do see a picture-beggar, Yama-paṭṭika, and a snake-charmer, Āhituṇḍika, figuring as spies, getting unsuspected access to *house-fronts* and gathering important information; but the intimate and private access meant by Kauṭilya in the passage in XI. i is different. The important persons meant to be done away with or decoyed are allured to secret places in the night to enjoy the company of these women. The entire chapter is full of references to women practising the arts of music, dance etc., and given to a life of easy virtue, being used as such agents of political plotting; and it is such women who can have easy and unsuspected access to and intimacy with important persons. Does the word Kauśika-strī have any meaning signifying a woman of such a description, who could go naturally with the two others mentioned along with her, the Nartakī and Gāyanā?

In the Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa, we have the character of an elderly woman in yellow robes, Parivrājikā, a Hindu lady recluse,[1] who is otherwise called Paṇḍita *Kauśikī* or Ārya *Kauśikī*[2]. We find her such an expert in the art of dance that the king and queen accept her as the judge in the dance contest;[3] when the queen is lying with a broken leg, she

or snake-charmer was originally included among the Anekārthas of Kauśika. Later, by a process of further secondary homonymical extension, Vyālagrāhi was taken to mean the well-known enemy of the snake, ichneumon, and Kauśika itself made to comprehend that animal too among its meanings.

[1] See I. 14.
[2] Act V.
[3] Acts I and II.

entertains her with stories[1]; later she exhibits her knowledge of the medical lore when the Vīdūṣaka is said to be smitten by a snake;[2] and finally the queen asks her to show her great proficiency in the art of dressing by getting up Mālavikā in the Vaidarbha style of marriage dress;[3] and, all the time, she was showing also her proficiency in advancing the love affair of the king and Mālavikā.[4] From this we gather that there was a class or community of persons which specialised in the arts of song, dance, toilette, (Sairandhrīkarman), love-affairs, etc., members of which were in the employ of kings and nobles, with whom they enjoyed great confidence. And the name *Kauśikī* by which this character is known in the Mālavikāgnimitra signifies the name of such a community.

On this, we shall now seek some light from Tamil literature: In the Tamil epic Śilappadikāram of Iḷaṅgo, in canto XIII called Puraṁceriyiruttakādai, we find the poet continuing the description of the journey of Kovalan and Kaṇṇaki, in the company of Kavundi, towards the city of Madura. They cross a forest in the Pāṇḍyan territory in the moonlit night, and at dawn reach a Brāhman village near Madura, which is described as follows by the poet:

வரி நவில் கொள்கை மறைநாவ் வழுக்கத்துப்
புரிநூன் மார்பருறை பதிச் சேர்ந்து

lines 38, 39

a village of Brāhmans who had fallen away from their study of the Vedas and were practising the art of music. The author of the gloss Arumpadavurai says that these Brāhmans were also called *Ambaṇavas*. Later, Kovalan is said to join these Brāhman musicians (பாடும்-பாணர்) of that village who were singing of *Antarī* (Durgā) to the accompaniment of Śeṅkoṭṭiyāḻ, a lute of that name.[5] Here again, the Arunpadavurai says that the expression 'Pāḍum Pāṇar' means 'Ambaṇavar' and the Śeṅkoṭṭiyāḻ is the yāḻ or lute of the Ambaṇavars.

---

1 Act IV.
2 Act IV.
3 Act V.
4 The Vidūṣaka calls her a Pīṭhamardikā in Act I, on her very first appearance.
5 Lines 105 ff.

In the same context, we are told that, Kauśikan, who is introduced abruptly, met Kovalan, delivered to him a love-message given by his erstwhile beloved courtezan Mādhavi, and went back to the city of Puhār to deliver that message to Kovalan's parents. From the description it appears that this Kauśika, also mentioned as Kośika, was a resident of Puhār city and that he went to console Mādhavi in her separation and took from her that message to Kovalan. The text mentions him once as Kauśikan (line 47) and thrice as Kośikamāni (lines 53, 56, 99). The Arumpadavurai says on line 47—

கவுசிகன்—கோசிக கோத்திரத்தான் ; பெயருமாம். இவன் மாதவி கடையாயினனோர் அந்தணன்—

that this Kauśika was a Brāhman attached to Mādhavi, *that Kauśikan means that he was of the Kauśika gotra, or perhaps it was his proper name.* This remark shows that the author of the gloss is not sure of the significance of this name Kauśika. That it cannot be his proper name is borne out by his being introduced abruptly and referred to thrice afterwards as Kauśikamāni, an expression similar to Devāra-māni, and meaning a Kauśika Brahmacāri or student. The second commentator Adiyārkkunallār interprets this Kośikan as *Bandi* Kośikan or *Vandi* Kośikan *i.e.,* a minstrel. It is clear from this that Kauśika is a common name of persons devoted to music and the arts and also serving as aids and messengers in love-affairs. Though this Kauśikan was a native of the city of Puhār, and though as the Arumpadavurai suggests, he might be attached to Mādhavi, we must note the special significance of his search for Kovalan fructifying in a village of Brāhmans who were, like himself, fallen from their real Brāhmanic status,[1] and were engaged in the pursuit of music. Having wandered in search of Kovalan, this Kauśika had come to that Brāhman village and was staying there, as it must have been natural and convenient for him to do so among persons of his own persuasion.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, Sundara I. 179 (Kumbhakonam edn.), we have in the midst of a description of the ærial way across

[1] On Brāhmans falling in status through their pursuit of the arts, Śilpa, see Manu III. 64, शिल्पेन व्यवहारेण etc.

which Hanumān was speeding, the words चरिते कैशिकाचार्यैः। Govindarāja says that as Kaiśika is the name of a Rāga, we have to understand by Kaiśikācāryas, musicians of Vidyādhara class who move about in the skies.

कैशिके रागविशेषे आचार्यैः विद्याधरविशेषैः इत्यर्थः ।

Tilaka takes Kaiśika as signifying the arts of music and dance and Kaiśikācāryas as Gandharvas like Tamburu.

कैशिकं गाननृत्यविद्या, तदाचार्यैः तुम्बुरुप्रभृतिगन्धर्वैः ।

Kataka interprets Kaiśika as music:

कैशिकं गानविद्या । तदाचार्यास्तुम्बुरुप्रमुखाः गन्धर्वाः ।

The commentary which I identify as Uḍāli's[1] says that Kaiśika is both a type of dance and a style of playing the sword, and that Kaiśikācāryas are Vidyādharas.

कैशिक इति नृत्तविशेषश्च खड्गमार्गे विशेषश्च । तत्राचार्या कैशिकाचार्याः, ते च विद्याधरवरिष्ठाः ।

Kaiśika as a Rāga and as a variety of the Niṣādasvara is well-known in music; as a style of dancing and of playing the sword too, it is well-known in Nāṭya Śāstra as one of the four Vṛttis[2]. In all these interpretations, the word Kaiśika is to be taken as having been used as an Upalakṣaṇa for music and dance. It may be mentioned here that in both the Eastern recension edited by Gorresio (Vol. IV. p. 171, Śl. 59) and in the N. Western recension edited from Lahore (Kiṣ. 62.40) 'Kaiśikācārya' is found as '*Kauśikācārya*'.[3] If Kauśika is the correct word here, we have to relate it to the word and meaning we have been discussing so far; and as Kauśika means a community of musicians, we have to understand it here in a secondary sense again, as the reference is to the celestial musicians like Gandharvas flying in the skies.

From this examination, we may interpret *Kauśika-striyaḥ* in Kauṭilaya XI. i as women of a class or community devoted to the arts of music, dance, toilette etc., employed in courts, and engaged frequently in aiding love-affairs.

---

1 See my article in the *Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras*, Vol. VI, pt. 2.

2 See my article on Vṛttis, *JOR.*, Madras, Vol. VII, pp. 34-6.

3 In fact in all its senses, according to lexicons, Kaiśika has the variant form Kauśika.

NANDIVARMAN II PALLAVAMALLA

DATE OF ACCESSION RECONSIDERED.

N. *Venkataramanayya*, M.A., PH.D.

In a paper contributed to the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras (*JOR.* VIII. pp. 1-8), I examined the problem of the date of accession of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla and arrived at the conclusion that he ascended the throne in A.D. 726 and ruled until A.D. 791. Certain facts which have come to my notice since the publication of that article, though they show that the period indicated is roughly accurate, render the reconsideration of the problem necessary. The first point that deserves mention here is a definite date for Narasimhavarman II, which may be described as the sheet-anchor of the chronology of the later Pallava kings of Kāñcī, furnished by Ts'o Fou Yuan Kouei, 'a Chinese encyclopædia compiled about A.D. 1013.' According to one of the passages in the work, "in the eighth year of K'ai-yuen (720), the King of the kingdom of South India, Che-li Na-lo-seng-kia (Śrī Narasimha), proposed to employ his war elephants and his cavalry to chastise the Ta-che (Arabs) as well as the T'ou-po (Tibetans) and others." Who this Śrī Narasimha was, is explained in another passage of the same work. "In the 11th month (of the 8th year of K'ai-yuen), an ambassador was sent to confer by brevet the title of the king of the kingdom of the South India, Che-li-Na-lo-seng-kia pao-to-pa-mo (Śrī Narasimha Pōtavarman.)" In addition to the information furnished by these two passages, *Kieou T'ang Chou* gives the following under the same year (720). "The 9th month, the king of South India, Che-li-Na-lo-seng-k'ia-to-pa (Śrī Narasimha Pōtavarman) constructed a temple on account of the empire (*i e.*, of China); he addressed to the emperor a request asking from him an inscription giving a name to this temple; by decree, it was decided that the name should be 'which causes return to virtue' (Koei-hoa) and it was presented to him (*i e.*, the emperor sent Narasimha a tablet with the inscription *Koei-hoa se*, so that it might be placed on the front of the temple erected in India by Narasimha for the benefit of China)."[1] It is evident from these

---

[1] K. A. Nilakanta Sastri: Foreign Notices of South India, Madras University Historical Series, No. 14, pp. 116-17.

extracts that Narasimha Pōtavarman *i.e.*, the Pallava king Narasimhavarman II, was ruling in A.D. 720. How long he continued to rule after this date, it is not possible to ascertain in the present state of our knowledge. For the convenience of the present discussion, A.D. 720 may be taken as the last year of the reign of Narasimhavarman II. Parmēśvaravarman II, who succeeded him, ruled only for a short period. As the only known record of his reign is dated in his 3rd regnal year[1], his reign must have lasted at least until A.D. 723. The reign of Paramēśvarman II, however ended in a great disaster. The Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ Koil inscription of *Pallavamalla* gives a graphic account of the condition of the Pallava kingdom after the death of Paramēśvaravarman II. It is stated that Paramēśvara Pōttaraiyar of the Pallava family, descending (in unbroken succession) from the God Brahmā, having departed to *Svarga*, the kingdom fell into ruin[2]. There was none to rule the people, and the country was plunged in anarchy. Therefore, 'a deputation of the *mātras*, the *mūlaprakṛtis*, and the *ghaṭikayār* waited on Hiraṇyavarman Mahārāja, and represented the fact that the country was without a ruler and requested him to grant them a soveriegn. Thereupon king Hiraṇyavarman sent for the chief potentates (*kulamallar*) and enquired which among them would accept sovereignty. *All of them refusing*, he asked his sons Śrīmalla, Raṇamalla, Sangrāmamalla, and Pallavamalla. Pallavamalla humbly offered, but king Hiraṇyavarman was at first *unwilling to risk his own son*, who was then only twelve years of age, in such a perilous undertaking. But Hiraṇyavarman was soon persuaded by Dharaṇikoṇḍa Pōśar to give his consent.'[3] It is evident from this that the election of Nandivarman Pallavamalla did not immediately follow the death of Paramēśvaravarman II but after an interval of anarchy and confusion, the duration of which cannot be definitely ascertained at present. This is corroborated by the evidence of the sculptures in the Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ Koil at Kāñcī illustrating the history of the Pallava dynasty. Between the panels representing the coronations of Paramēśvaravarman II and Nandivarman Pallavamalla, there intervenes a panel left purposely blank by the sculptors. "We have", says Dr. C. Minakshi, "a further

---

[1] 56 of 1903.

[2] SII. IV. no. 133.

[3] EI. xviii, p. 123*f*.

proof of this (anarchy), in the blank space which occupies this wall next to the coronation of Nandivarman. We learn that the Pallava kingdom experienced total anarchy after the death of Paramēśvara, and nothing could represent this condition better than a blank space."[1] Though it is not possible to discover when exactly Nandivarman II Pallavamalla was chosen as the king of Kāñcī, it is certain that this event took place sometime before A.D. 733. According to an interesting passage in the Udayēndiram plates, dated in the 21st year of Pallavamalla, his commander Udayacandra 'pursued and defeated the Niṣāda chief named Pṛthvīvyāghra who was running after the *aśvamēdha* horse in the north; made Viṣṇurāja's country Pallava territory (*i.e.*, he conquered Viṣṇurāja's country and annexed it to the Pallava kingdom); and having brought Niravadya and others under his control, took (from them) beautiful necklaces, large quantities of gold and elephants."[2] Viṣṇurāja, mentioned in this passage, is identical with the Eastern Cāḷukya king, Viṣṇuvardhana, very probably the third of that name[3]; and Niravadya with the Western

---

[1] Historical Sculptures in the Vaikuṇṭha Perumāḷ Koil at Kāñcī, p. 32.

[2] SII. II. p. 368. ll. 55-59. l. 55. [*Uttararasyām* l. 56 *api disi Pṛthvī-Vyāghr=abhidhā* [*na**] *n=Niṣa*) *da-patiṁ prabalāya mānam=aśva nē l. 57. dha-turangam=*[*ā**] *nusaraṇam=ipa taṁ =anusrtya vijitya-viṣayāt=Pa l. 58. llasātkṛtya=ādisan= Niravadya-pramukhān śuhārān aparimita-suvarṇa-saṁca-yaṁ kuñjarān=api yō jagraha*] The passage as corrected by Dr. V. Raghavan runs as follows:—"*Uttarasyām=api diśi Pṛthvī-Vyāghrābhidhanam Niṣada-patim prapalayamānam=aśvāmēdha-turangam=ānusaraṇam-=api tam=anusṛtya vijitya Viṣṇurāja-viṣayān Pallava sātkṛtya ādiśan=Niravadya-pramukhān suhārān=aparimita-suvarṇa-saṁcayaṁ kuñjarān=api yo jagrāha.*

[3] The chronology of the early Eastern Cālukya kings is not yet settled. The scheme of chronology suggested by late Dr. Fleet (IA. xx. pp. 1, 93, 20o) is antiquated; and the dates suggested by him either for Viṣṇuvardhana III or Viṣṇuvardhana IV cannot be accepted. With the help of the chronological data, collected since the publication of Fleet's articles, Messrs. B. V. Krishna Rao (JAHRS. ix. pp. 1-32) and M. Somasekhara Sarma (JOR. x. pp. 27-45) formulated fresh schemes of the Eastern Cālukya chronology. Though the new schemes are undoubtedly an improvement on Fleet's preliminary attempt, neither of them is free from difficulties and cannot in their entirety be accepted without

Cāḷukya Vijayāditya, who ruled until A.D. 733.[1] An inscription at Annavaram in the Darsi division of the present Nellore district, shows that the authority of the Cālukya kings of Bādāmi was acknowledged in the south of the coastal Telugu country.[2] There can be little doubt that Niravadya from whom Udayacandra wrested jewels, gold and elephants in the course of his northern campaign was the Western Cāḷukya king Vijayāditya. It follows from this that Nandivarman II who had been elected the king of the Pallavas sometime before this date was ruling at the time. His accession to the throne must therefore be assigned to some date between A.D. 723 and 733. A casual statement found in some Western Ganga grants of the closing years of the 8th century A.D., which has an indirect bearing on the subject, must be taken up for consideration in this context. In the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates of Yuvarāja Mārasimha, son of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa, dated A.D. 797 and 799 respectively, it is stated that "by the ornaments of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Pallava lines, the crowned kings named Gōvindarāja and Nandivarmmā, was he anointed to the kingdom, they with their own hands binding the crown on his brow,—the sun, to the clear firmament of the Ganga line, Kongaṇi Mahārājādhirāja Paramēśvara Śivamāra-Dēva."[3] Before proceeding to point out the bearing of this statement on the date of the accession of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, it is necessary to settle the identity of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Pallava monarchs, who bound with their own hands the

---

reserve. According to Mr. Krishna Rao, Viṣṇuvardhana III ruled from A.D. 719 to 755, and Viṣṇuvardhana IV from A.D. 772 to 898. Mr. Sarma, however, assigns Viṣṇuvardhana III to A.D. 727 to 763 and Viṣṇuvardhana IV to A.D. 780 to 814.

1 That Vijayāditya was known by the title of Niravadya is evident from the following passage in the Paṭṭadakal inscription [E. I. III, p. 47] of his grandson Kīrtivarman III:—

'Sūrya-sutaṁ=iva dānaratas=sadā Vṛkōdaraṁ=iva sāhasa-rasikaḥ Śrī-niravady=ōdāra Vijayāditya-Satrāśraya Pṛthvī-Vallabha Mahārāja-Paramēśvara Parama-bhaṭṭārekēna. The terms *niravady-=ōdāra are reminiscent of the expressions "udāratvān=niravad-yatvād"* used in the Kendur and the Vakkalēri plates to describe the liberality and the irreproachable conduct of Vijayāditya (EI. ix. p. 200, v, p. 200).

2 183 of 1933-4.

3 EC. ix. Nl. 60, MAR 1924, no. 80.

crown on the brow of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa at the time of his coronation.

First, about Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja:—Of the four kings of the name of Gōvindarāja mentioned in the genealogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkhed embodied in their inscriptions, the first and the last may be left out of consideration, as the former is too early and latter too late to have been a contemporary of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa. The remaining two, Gōvinda II (A.D. 772-780), and Govinda III (A.D. 794-813) were certainly his contemporaries. Now, the question is which of these two is the Gōvindarāja, who together with Pallava Nandivarmmā participated in Śivamāra's coronation and placed the crown upon his head. Although it is generally believed that it is Gōvinda III who joined Pallavamalla in crowning him, the validity of this belief has been called into question by Mr. M. Somasekhara Sarma; he is of opinion that the Ganga king Śrīpuruṣa, the father of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa, after a rule of fifty years, was killed in battle in A.D. 775 by Kāḍuveṭṭi of Kāñcī; that after his death, the succession to the Ganga throne was disputed by his sons Duggamāra and Śivamāra Saigotta; that 'apprehending danger from the common enemy Dhruva who, gradually gaining power in the north, was intending to invade the southern kingdoms, both Nandivarman Pallavamalla of Kāñcī and Gōvinda II took advantage of the situation in the Ganga kingdom, and, in order to strengthen their own position, began to take an interest in the Ganga affairs; and that 'they both, espousing the cause of Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa, who was perhaps the eldest son of Śrīpuruṣa, anointed him heir to the Ganga kingdom,' and helped him actively to overthrow Duggamāra."[1] This view is open to serious objections. In the first place, there is no evidence to show that Śrīpuruṣa was killed in A.D. 775 or at any other time in a battle with Kāḍuveṭṭi of Kāñci. The Kuldikki epigraph, dated in the 52nd year of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, on the authority of which Mr. Sarma assumes the death of Śrīpuruṣa in a battle with Kāḍuveṭṭi in A.D. 775, does not support his contention. 'It records,' as stated by the epigraphist, 'the death of Gangadiyaraiyar Kaṇṇāḍu Perungangar, the chief of Kaṟkāṭṭūr, who, at the instance of *māmaḍi*, the Bāṇa king, fell on the day, when the

[1] 'A Miscellany of Papers, Publislied in honour of the late Rao Saheb G. Rāmamūrti Pantulu), pp. 119-120, 127-8.

Pallava army marched against Perumānadigal, and destroyed (the fortress of) Penukulikottai."[1] It is obivous that G. K. Perungangar, the petty chief of Karkāttūr (Kalakāttūr in the *Palamneri taluk of the Chittoor district*) was a subordinate of the Bāṇa ruler, and the fact that he, at the instance of his overlord, attempted to check the advance of the Pallava army on Perumānadigal and perished in the attempt, does not offer any justification for identifying him with Perumānadigal himself. G. K. Perungangar, as pointed out by me elsewhere, was a third party;[2] and Perumānadigal was in fact the liege-lord and sovereign of his overlord, the Bāṇa chief, who ordered him to proceed against the Pallava army and arrest their progress. That Śrīpuruṣa did not die in A.D. 775, but was alive for more than a decade after that year is shown by an inscription of his reign dated Śaka 710 (A.D. 788).[3] As it was not usual for kings to celebrate their coronation during the life time of their predecessors, it may be presumed that the coronation of Śivamāra Saigotta did not take place until after the death of his father in A.D. 788 or later. Therefore, Gōvinda II whose reign came to an end in A.D. 780 or 781 could not have been the Gōvindarāja who joined Pallava Nandivarmmā in celebrating his coronation. Nor had Gōvinda II any share in the overthrow of Duggamāra. According to verse 24 of the Jethwai plates of Śīla Mahādēvi, the chief queen of Dhruva, dated A.D. 786, Dhruva conquered Durga who had all the strength of the three worlds, and augmented his fame by imprisoning the entire Ganga family, and appropriated for himself the prosperity of (a ruler) whose insignia was the bull; he alone displayed in this world the quality of Paramēśvara (supreme ruler) clearly and powerfully, just as Śiva etc. [4] Moreover, the evidence of the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates clearly shows that it was not

[1] ARE. 145 of 1921, EI. xxii, No. 18, p. 110.

[2] JOR. viii. p. 5 n.3.

[3] Rep. Mys. Arch. Dept. 1918, p. 42. It is true that in this record 'no royal titles are attached,' as pointed out by Mr. Sarma, "to the name of Śrīpuruṣa." (A Miscellany of Papers p. 120) There is nothing exceptional in this. Several records of Śrīpuruṣa, in which he is referred to without any titles are known; and there is nothing in the present record to show that Śrīpuruṣa mentioned in it was a subordinate and not the king himself.

[4] EI. xxii. No. 17, pp. 98-109.

Gōvinda II, but his nephew Gōvinda III who crowned Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa. Both the records refer at first to his victory over the Vallabha army, supported by Rāṣṭrakūṭa, Cāḷukya, Haihaya, and other leaders at Mudugunḍūr; then they allude to the defeat of the powerful cavalry of Dhōra (Dhruva); and mention finally his coronation, when he was crowned by Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja and Pallava Nandivarmmā.[2] It is obvious that Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja referred to in these records could not have been Gōvinda II, the elder brother of Dhruva, but his son and successor, Gōvinda III.

Second, about Pallava Nandivarmmā:—Opinion also is divided about the identity of the Pallava king Nandivarmmā, mentioned in the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates. Though he is generally taken to have been identical with Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar contends that he was not

---

Yo='sau prasādhita-jagat-traya-sāra Durgō
Gaṁg-augha-santati-nirōdha-vivṛddha-kīrtiḥ|
Ātmīkṛt=ōnnata-Vṛṣāṅka-vibhūtir=uccair=
Yatkaṁ tatāna Paramēśvaratāṁ=ih=aikaḥ||

Dr. D.R. Bhaṇḍārkar's rendering of this verse is quite unsatisfactory and misleading; unsatisfactory, because, he misses the historical information conveyed by the expression, *prasādhita-jagat-traya-sāra-durgo* by translating it as 'he reduced to subjection forts (*durga*) which were the cream of the three worlds;' and misleading because he states that *Vṛṣāṅka* was the Eastern Cāḷukya king. Commenting on this verse, he says, 'the second historical fact to be deduced from the same verse of our grant is that he made his own the prosperity of a ruler whose family insignia was the bull. Who could this prince be? Obviously he could be no other than a prince of the (Eastern) Cāḷukya family of Vengi who had the bull as their badge. And this prince again could be no other than his father-in-law, Viṣṇuvardhana IV." (p. 104). This, in cold print, from the pen of a scholar and historian of the eminence of Dr. Bhandarkar, is quite astounding! Still more astounding is the silence of the editors of Epigraphia India, who never let go an opportunity to enlighten the scholarly public by their illuminating observations. It is common knowledge of all the students of South Indian history that the 'boar' (*varāha*) was the badge of all the branches of the Cāḷukya family including the Eastern Cāḷukyas of Vengi, and the bull (*vṛṣa*) the badge of the Pallavas of Kāñcī.

[2] EC. ix. Nl. 60, MAR. 1924, No. 80.

Pallavamalla, but his grandson Nandivarman III, the victor of Teḷḷāṟu. He is led to this conclusion by his interpretation of the data about the chronology of the later Pallava soveriegns. He starts with A.D. 888, the date on which Āditya I overthrew Aparājita and established the Cōḷa monarchy, and proceeds to calculate backwards with the help of the regnal years furnished by the later Pallava inscriptions. As the latest regnal year found in Aparājita's records is 18, he arrives, by deducting 18 from 888, at A.D. 870 as the first year of his reign. His predecessor, Nṛpatunga ruled for 26 years; and the initial date of his reign is placed in (870—26=) 844. Here he encounters his first hurdle. As the latest regnal year quoted in the inscriptions of Nṛpatunga's father and predecessor, Nandivarman III, the victor of Teḷḷāṟu, is 22, he must have commenced to rule according to Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar's computation, in (844—22=) 822 A.D. This, however, he is not able to accept, as he has to accommodate an inconvenient fact, *viz.*, the synchronism of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvindarāja and Pallava Nandivarmmā, mentioned in the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates. As the latest regnal year found in the inscriptions of Dantivarman, the father and predecessor of Nandivarman III, is 51, his initial year must be placed in (822-51=) 771 A.D. and this leaves no Nandivarman who could have been a contemporary of Gōvinda III. To get over this difficulty, Mr. Subrhmanya Aiyer lengthens the reign of Nandivarman III by ten years, and takes it back to A.D. 812. As the last known date of Gōvinda III is A.D. 814, the cornonation of Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa in which Gōvinda III and Nandivarman participated may be conveniently assigned to the period 812-14. "The latest regnal year found for him (Nandivarman III) in his inscriptions mentioning the victory of Teḷḷāṟu," says he, "is 22. But there is a possibility of his having reigned longer. If he had a reign of 22 years, his accession would have to be placed in A.D. 822. This cannot be the case, for, we learn from the Western Ganga grants that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, Gōvinda III and the Pallava King Nandivarman—both crowned kings themselves—fastened the fillet of royalty on the forehead of Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭta. The last year of Gōvinda III being A.D. 814, this event should have occured before that date, say about A.D. 812. Accordingly, we have to take back the year of accession of Nandivarman III by ten years."[1] Apart from the arbitrary

---

[1] EI, xx. No. 3, pp. 49-50.

character of this procedure, there is another important fact militating against Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyer's view, which he seems to have overlooked. The coronation of Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa, according to his chronological scheme, must have taken place between A.D. 812 and 814; but the Maṇṇe and the Ālūr plates, the only records which refer to this event, are dated, as noticed already, in A.D. 797 and 799 respectively. It cannot he said that the authors of these charters foretold an event which was still in the womb of the future. Therefore, the coronation of Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa must have taken place sometime before A.D. 797 and not between A.D. 812 and 814, as Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer would have us believe. As Dantivarman, the father and predecessor of Nandivarman III, the victor of Teḷḷāṟu, was, as shown by the Rāmēśvaram grant of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III, ruling in Kāñcī in A.D. 803[1], he could not have been the *Mūrdhābhiṣikta* Pallava Nandivarmmā, who participated in Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa's coronation. This leads us to the conclusion that Pallava Nandivarmmā of the Maṇṇe and Ālūr plates must have been Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, the grandfather of Nandivarman III. This is not at all unlikely. Paramēśvarman II, the predecessor of Nandivarman II, it may be remembered, ruled until at least A.D. 723, and then there ensued a period of anarchy of uncertain duration at the end of which the latter was elected king. As he ruled at least for sixty-five years, his reign must have lasted almost up to the end of 8th century A.D. There is therefore nothing improbable in his having joined Gōvinda III to crown Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa, as the king of the Gangas. The coronation of Śivamāra could not have taken place earlier than A.D. 795. He was taken prisoner by Dhruva in A.D. 786 and was kept in confinement ever since. His father Śrīpuruṣa died sometime after A.D. 788, and his ancestral kingdom was annexed by Dhruva. Gōvinda III who succeeded his father in A.D. 794 took, according to Wani-Dindori and Rādhanpūr plates,[2] compassion on him, set him at liberty and sent him back to his country. Therefore, his coronation could have taken place only after his return to his kingdom, in A.D. 794 or in the succeeding year.

The foregoing discussion makes it clear that Nandivarman II Pallavamalla and Gōvinda III performed the coronation of

---

[1] IA. xi. pp. 125-27.
[2] IA. xi. p.156 f, EI. vi, pp. 229-51.

Śivamāra and placed with their own hands the royal crown on his head. Assuming that this event had taken place in the 65th or the last known year of his rule, the initial date of his reign must be placed in A.D. (795-65=)730 A.D. A possible objection to this date must not be left unnoticed here. The Cōḷa king Āditya, as pointed out by Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar, defeated Aparājita, the last Pallava monarch, and put an end to the Pallava monarchy in A.D. 888. It follows from this that there elapsed 158 years between the accession of Nandivarman II and the overthrow of Aparājita; but the total number of years for which Nandivarman II and his successors ruled comes to (Nandivarman II, 65 years+Dantivarman 51 years+ Nandivarman III 22 years+Nṛpatungavarman 26 years+ Aparājita 18 years) 182 years or 24 years more than the period indicated by our data. How are we to account for this difference? The difficulty, however, is not as insurmountable as it may appear at first sight. Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyer has himself indicated the way for solving the problem. While attempting to accommodate the reign of Kampavarman in his chronological scheme, he suggested, accepting Hultzsch's interpretation of the term Nandi-Kampa occuring in a Sōḻapuram epigraph as Kampavarman, the son of Nandivarman III, that Kampavarman was a 'joint ruler with either Nṛpatunga or Aparājita or with both.'[20] It is not impossible that the reigns of Nandivarman Pallavamalla and his successors overlapped one another. The father might have crowned his grown up son, as was done by the later Cōḷa kings and to some extent by the contemporary Cālukya rulers of Bādāmi, during his own life time, and taken him into partnership in the administration of the kingdom. Instead of taking the reigns of Nandivarman II and his successors in a regular consecutive order, provision must be made for the partial coincendence of successive reigns. A correct solution of the chronology of the later Pallava kings lies perhaps in this direction.

---

[20] EI. xx. pp. 48-9.

SOME EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF THE AŚVACIKITSITA OF NAKULA (BEFORE A.D. 1000).

BY

P. K. GODE, M.A.

Curator,

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, POONA, 4.

In the list of works and authors mentioned and quoted in the *Yuktikalpataru*[1] of King Bhoja as recorded by Pandit Isvara Chandra Sastri, I do not find the name of *Nakula*, who is quoted from in the अश्वयुक्ति section of the *Yuktikalpataru* as follows:—

Page 183—

" अथ वर्णाः[2] ।

यदाह नकुलः—

सप्तवर्णा भवन्तीह सर्वेषां वाजिनां ध्रुवम् ।

तानहं कीर्त्तयिष्यामि भेदैर्ज्ञातानने‌कधा ॥ ३८ ॥

सितो रक्तस्तथा पीतः सारङ्गः पिङ्ग एव च ।

---

[1] d. with a Foreword by Dr. N. N. Law, Calcutta, 1917—On the last page the following names of works and authors quoted in the *Yuktikalpataru* are recorded:—

बृहस्पतिनीतिः, उशनसी, गर्गः, भोजः, भविष्योत्तरम्, पराशरः, नीतिशास्त्रम् , मत्स्यपुराणम् , वात्स्यः, पराशरसंहिता, गरुडपुराणम् , विष्णुधर्मोत्तरम् , गारुडः, लौहार्णवः, लौहद्वीपः, लौहप्रदीपः, पद्मपुराणम् , बृहद्धारीतः, नागार्जुनः, गर्ग्यः, पालगाकाप्यः, शङ्खः ।

2. *Cf.* वर्णाध्याय (verses 1—30) in अश्वायुर्वेद of वाग्भट, son of विक्रम (B.O.R. Insti te, MS. No. 581 of 1899—1915) *folios* 15—16.

" अभिधास्यामि वर्णानामिदानीमत्र लक्षणम् ।

श्वेतः कृष्णोऽरुणः पीतः शुद्धाश्चत्वार एव हि ॥ १ ॥

पञ्चमोऽन्यस्तु वर्णस्यान्मिश्रश्चान्योन्यसंगतौ ।

ख्याता वर्णाः षडेवैते जाता भेदादनेकधा ॥ २ ॥ etc.

नीलः कृष्णोऽथ सर्वेषां श्वेतः श्रेष्ठतमो मतः ॥ ३९ ॥
श्वेतः कुन्देन्दुसङ्काशो रक्तः कौसुम्भसन्निभः ।
हरिद्रासदृशः पीतः सारङ्गः कर्बुरः स्मृतः ॥ ४० ॥
पिश(ष)ङ्गः कपिलाकारो नीलो दूर्वादलप्रभः ।
कृष्णो जम्बूफलाकारः शालिहोत्रैः समुदाहृतः ॥ ४१ ॥
इति अश्ववर्णाः ।"

The above quotation raises the question of Bhoja's indebtedness to नकुल, whose अश्वचिकित्सित was published long ago in the *Bibliotheca Indica* (Calcutta, 1887). It will be clear from the following evidence that the अश्वयुक्ति of Bhoja's युक्तिकल्पतरु is indebted to the अश्वचिकित्सित of नकुलः—

(1) The quotation from नकुल introduced with the words "यदाह नकुलः' reproduced above is taken from Chapter 3 of नकुल–अश्वचिकित्सित (pp. 7-8 of *Bib. Indica*, Edition, 1887) where it reads as follows:—

अथ तृतीयोऽध्यायः । वर्णवर्णनम् ।
वर्णाः सप्त भवन्तीह सर्वेषां वाजिनां ध्रुवम् ।
तानहं कीर्त्तयिष्यामि भेदैर्जातानेनकधा ॥ १ ॥
सितो रक्तस्तथा पीतः सारङ्गः पिङ्ग एव च ।
नीलः कृष्णोऽथ सर्वेषां श्वेतः श्रेष्ठतमः स्मृतः ॥ २ ॥
श्वेतः प्रालेयसङ्काशो रक्तः कुङ्कुमसन्निभः ।
हरिद्रासदृशः पीतः सारङ्गः कर्बुरः स्मृतः ॥ ३ ॥
पिङ्गः कपिलकाकारो नीलो दूर्वाप्रसंनिभः ।
कृष्णो जम्बूफलाकारः शालिहोत्रैः समुदाहृतः ॥ ४ ॥

In spite of a few variants this passage is almost identical with the passage quoted by Bhoja with the words यदाह नकुलः"

(2) To corroborate the above identification I record below additional comparison of verses and groups of verses common to भोज and नकुलः—

Bhoja (=B) p. 181—

" सपक्षा वाजिनः पूर्व्वं संजाता व्योमचारिणः ।
गन्धर्वेभ्यो यथा कामं गच्छन्ति च समन्ततः ॥ २३ ॥

Cf. Nakula (=N) p. 2.

" सपक्षा वाजिनः सर्वे (पूर्व्वं) संजाता व्योमचारिणः ।
गन्धर्वेभ्यो यथा कामं गच्छन्ति च समन्ततः ॥ ५ ॥

B. 181—" उत्तमा मध्यमा नीचाः कनीयांसस्तथा परे ।
चतुर्धा वाजिनो भूमौ जायन्ते देशसंश्रयात् ॥ २५ ॥

B. 182—" ताजिताः खुरशालाश्च तुषाराश्चोत्तमा हयाः ।
गोजिकाणाश्च केकाणाः प्रौढाहाराश्च मध्यमाः । २६ ॥
ताड़जा उत्तमाशाश्च राजशूलाश्च मध्यमाः ।
गत्वराः साध्यवासाश्च (*v. l.* साध्ववासाश्च) सिन्धुदाराः कनीयसः ॥
अन्यदेशोद्भवा ये च ते वै नीचाः प्रकीर्त्तिताः ।
वाजिनो जलजाः केचिद्वह्निजातास्तथापरे ॥ २८ ॥
समीरप्रभवाश्चान्ये तुरगा मृगजाः परे ।
जलोद्भवा द्विजा ज्ञेयाः क्षत्रिया वह्निसंभवाः ॥ २९ ॥
प्रभञ्जनभवा वैश्या मृगजाः शूद्रजातयः ।
पुष्पगन्धिर्भवेद्विप्रः क्षत्रियोऽगुरुगन्धिकः ॥ ३० ॥
घृतगन्धो भवेद्वैश्यो मीनामोदी च शूद्रकः ।
विवेकी सघृणो विप्रस्तेजस्वी क्षत्रियो बली ॥ ३१ ॥
कोष्णभावो (भावे) भवेद्वैश्यः शूद्रो निःसत्वको भवेत् ।
विप्राद्याः वाहनाः सर्वे प्रिया भूमिपतेः सदा ।"

Cf. N, 4—" उत्तमा मध्यमा नीचा कनीयांसस्तथापरे ।
चतुर्धा वाजिनो भूमौ जायन्ते देशसंश्रयात् ॥ १ ॥
ताजिकाः खुरशाणाश्च उत्तराश्चोत्तमा हयाः ।
गोजिकाणाश्च केकाणा प्रौढाहाराश्च मध्यमाः ॥ २ ॥
भाण्डजाश्चोत्तमांसाश्च राजशूलाश्च मध्ययाः ।
गोह्वराः शावराश्चैव सिन्धुपाराः कनीयसः ॥ ३ ॥
अन्यदेशोद्भवा ये च नीचनीचाश्च ते स्मृताः ।
वाजिनो जलजाः केचिद्वह्निजातास्तथापरे ॥ ४ ॥
समीरप्रभवाश्चान्ये उलूकमृगजास्तथा ।
जलोद्भवा द्विजातीयाः (*v. l.* द्विजा ज्ञेयाः) क्षत्रिया वाह्निसंभवाः ॥
समीरप्रभवा वैश्या एणोलूकाश्च शूद्रजाः ।
विवेकी सघृणो विप्रस्तेजस्वी क्षत्रियो बली ॥ ६ ॥

दुष्टभावस्तथा वैश्यः शूद्रो निःसत्त्वकातरः (कारकः ।)

ब्राह्मणः सामवाही च भेदवाही च क्षत्रियः ॥ ७ ॥

उपादानेन वैश्यः स्याच्छूद्रो दण्डेन ताडितः ।

पुष्पगन्धः सदा विप्रः क्षत्रियोऽगुरुगन्धकः ॥ ८ ॥

घृतगन्धः सदा वैश्यो मीनामोदी च शूद्रकः ।

विप्राद्या वाजिनः सर्वे क्षत्रियो भूपतेः सदा ॥ ९ ॥

B, *186*—" नासिकाग्रे ललाटाग्रे शङ्खे कण्ठे च मस्तके ।

आवर्त्ता जायते येषां ते धन्यास्तुरगोत्तमाः ॥ ६२ ॥

ललाटे यस्य चावर्त्तो द्वितीयस्तु ककुन्दरे ।

मस्तके च तृतीयस्तु स विज्ञेयो हयोत्तमः ॥ ६३ ॥

Cf. *N*, *10*—" नासिकाग्रे ललाटाग्रे शङ्खे कण्ठे च मस्तके ।

आवर्त्तो जायते येषां ते धन्यास्तुरगोत्तमाः ॥ ४ ॥

....

ललाटे यस्य चावर्त्तो द्वितीयस्च स लिङ्गकः ।

मस्तके च तृतीयश्च पूर्णकुक्षिः स उत्तमः ॥ ६ ॥

B, *186*—" द(ग)ण्डावर्त्तो भवेद्यस्य वाजिनो दक्षिणाश्रयः ।

स करोति महासौख्यं स्वामिनः शिरसंज्ञितः (साङ्कितः) ॥ ६४ ॥

Cf. *N*, *11*—" गण्डावर्त्तो भवेद्यस्य वाजिनो दक्षिणाश्रयः ।

(*v*. *l*. कपोलाभ्यन्तरावर्त्ता विद्येते)

स करोति महासौख्यं स्वामिनः शिवसंज्ञिकः ॥ १५ ॥

B, *186*—" कर्णमूले यदावर्त्तः स्तनमध्ये तथापरः ।

विजयाख्यावुभौ तौ तु युद्धकाले जयप्रदौ ॥ ६५ ॥

Cf *N*, *12*—" कर्णमूले यदावर्त्तस्तन्मध्ये च तथापरः ।

विजयाख्यावुभौ ज्ञेयौ युद्धकाले जयप्रदौ ॥ १७ ॥

B, *186*—" नासामध्ये यदावर्त्त एको वा यदि वा त्रयः ॥ ६६ ॥

चक्रवर्त्ती स विज्ञेयो वाजी भूपालभूषितः ।

कण्ठे यस्य महावर्त्तः प्रोक्तश्चिन्तामणिः शुभः ॥ ६७ ॥

Cf. *N*, *12*—" नासामध्ये यदावर्त एको वा यदि वा त्रयः ।

चक्रवर्त्ती स विज्ञेयो वाजी भूपालपूजितः ॥ १८ ॥

कण्ठे यस्य महावर्त्त एकोऽश्वस्य (एकः स्पष्टः) प्रजायते ।

चिन्तामणिः स विज्ञेयश्चिन्तितार्थविवृद्धिदः ॥ १७ ॥

B, 186—" स्कन्धपार्श्वे यदावर्त्तः स भवेत्सुखकारकः ।"

Cf. N, 12—" स्कन्धे पार्श्वे यदावर्त्तः स भवेत् पद्मलक्षणः ।
करोति विधिवत्पद्मे स्वामिनः सततं सुखम् ॥ २० ॥

B, 184—" चतुर्भिर्वत्सरैर्दन्ताश्चत्वारः परिकीर्त्तिताः ।
पञ्चभिश्च षड्भिश्चैवं जायन्ते त्वथ कालिकाः ॥ ४४ ॥
षष्ठे संवत्सरे प्राप्ते कालिकान्या भवेत् तु हि ।
तथान्या सप्तमे वर्षे चतुर्थी (*vl.* चतुर्थे) कालिका भवेत् ॥ ४५ ॥
अष्टमे वत्सरे प्राप्ते जायन्ते सर्वकालिकाः ।
नवमे त्वथ ताः सर्वा आपीताः सम्भवन्ति च ॥ ४६ ॥
केचिदेकादशे वर्षे तावत्पीतत्वमागताः ।
ततः श्वेता प्रजायन्ते चतुर्दशसमावधि ॥ ४७ ॥
ततः काचप्रभा सम्यग् यावत्संवत्सरास्त्रयः ।
ततः सप्तदशादूर्ध्वं यावद्वर्षाणि विंशतिः ॥ ४८ ॥
माक्षिकाभां त्रदन्त्येषां (*v. l.* मक्षिभाभात्रदन्तेषां) यावद्वर्षत्रयं पुनः ।"

Cf. N, 14—" चतुर्भिर्वत्सरैर्दन्ताः कालिकान्ये भवन्ति च ।
तथान्यः सप्तमे वर्षे चतुर्थः कालिको भवेत् ॥ ४ ॥
अष्टमे वत्सरे प्राप्ते प्राप्ताः स्युः सार्वकालिकाः ।
नवमे त्वथवा रेखा पीतत्वं शंसयन्ति च ॥ ५ ॥
तथाप्येकादशे वर्षे तावत्पीतत्वमागताः ।
तिष्ठन्ति दशनास्तेषां वाजिनामप्यसंशयम् ॥ ६ ॥
ततः श्वेताः प्रदृश्यन्ते यावद्वर्षत्रयं पुनः ।
ततः काचप्रभा सम्यक् यावत्संवत्सरास्त्रयः ॥ ७ ॥
ततः सप्तदशादूर्ध्वं यावद्वर्षाणि विंशतिः ।
मक्षिकाभा रदास्तेषां यावद्वर्षत्रयं पुनः ॥ ८ ॥

B, 184—" कालिका हरिणी शुक्ला काचा मक्षिकया सह ।
शङ्खो मूषलकश्चैव दन्तानां चलतां (ता) तथा ॥"

Cf. N, 15—" कालिका हारिणी शुक्ला काचा वाप्यथ मक्षिकाः ॥ १ ॥
शङ्खो दूखलकश्चैव दन्तानां चलनं तथा ।"

B, 184—" यस्य दत्ता यवा भोज्ये शिशिरे समुपस्थिते ।
अकृत्वापि क्रियाः सर्वाः स हयः सुखमृच्छति ॥ ३७ ॥

Cf. N 40—" यस्य दत्ता यवा भोज्ये शिशिरे समुपस्थिते ।
अकृतापि (*v. l.* क्रिया अपि) कृता सर्वा पश्चर्तुजनिता हये ॥ १८

B 190—" चलकिशलयपादः कर्णमध्यैकदृष्टि-
र्न चलति कटिदेशः स्वासने संस्थितो यः ।
हयहृदयगतिज्ञः स्थानदण्डवतापः (०दण्डावपाती)
स खलु तुरगयाता पूज्यते पार्थिवेन्द्रैः ॥ २ ॥
मेरुः स्थिरो यस्य चलौ च पादौ
त्रिकोन्नतं संहतमासनश्च ।
स वाजिवाहः प्रथितः पृथिव्यां
शेषा नरा भारकरा हयानाम् ॥ ३ ॥

Cf. N, 21—" चलकिसलयपादः कर्णमध्यैकदृष्टिः
न चलति कटिदेशे आसने संस्थितश्च ।
हयहृदयगतिज्ञः स्थानदण्डावपाती
स खलु तुरगयोक्ता मान्यते पार्थिवेन्द्रैः ॥

B, 185—" दीर्घाः शुष्का विशालास्या ये भवन्ति तुरङ्गमाः ।
ते शस्ताः पार्थिवेन्द्रस्य यानवाहनकर्मणि ॥ ५२ ॥

Cf. N, 16—" दीर्घसूक्ष्मावभासास्या ये भवन्ति तुरङ्गमाः ।
ते शस्ताः पार्थिवेन्द्रस्य यानवाहनकर्मणि ॥ १ ॥

The foregoing comparison of extracts from the अश्वयुक्ति section of Bhoja's युक्तिकल्पतरु and from the अश्वचिकित्सित of Nakula clearly shows how Bhoja, who definitely mentions नकुल by name and quotes from his अश्वचिकित्सित has borrowed freely from Nakula's work. If the अश्वयुक्ति section in the युक्तिकल्पतरु is a genuine work of king Bhoja we have to conclude that the अश्वचिकित्सित of नकुल is earlier than Bhoja (*C.A.D.* 1050.) We are thus in a position to determine *the later limit for Nakula's work viz. C.A.D.* 1000.

As regards the earlier limit to Nakula's अश्वचिकित्सित I have to make the following observations:—

(1) The passage mentioning the *Arabian* (ताजिक) and *Khurasan* (खुरशाण) horses as the best horses is common to both Bhoja and Nakula as we have seen above. The expression " ताजिताः खरशालाः" in Bhoja's अश्वयुक्ति is a misreadinng for " ताजिकाः खुरशाणाः' used by Nakula.

(2) *Khurasan*[1] is a Province of North East Persia, bounded on the North by the U.S.S.R., on the West by Mazandaran and Iraq Ajemi, on the South by Kuhistan, and on the East by Afghanistan. It consists partly of desert and partly of high-lying land portions of which are fertile. Evidently the खुरशाण horses are equivalent to पारसीक horses, mentioned by जयदत्त in his अश्ववैद्यक, by the अमरलाश, by हेमचन्द्र in his अभिधान-चिन्तामणि (C.A.D. 1140), by सामेश्वर in his मानसाेल्लास (*C.A.D.* 1130) and even by बाण in his हर्षचरित (C.A. 130.)[2]

(3) I have presumed that the ताजिक horses mentioned by नकुल and भोज are equivalent to Arabian horses on the assurance of some friends. The Marathi Dictionary called the *Śabdakośa* mentions ताजी = Arabi horse (Arabic—ताझी). Whether the term ताजिक is identical with ताजी cannot be said with certainty as in the *Ain-i-Akbari* (p. 156 of Gladwin's Zeans 1897) seven kinds of horses are mentioned, in which the *Arab* horse is distinquished from the *Tazee*, which is given as the name of the best horse "mostly bred in Hindustan." To make confusion worse confounded we have *Tajik* as the name of a republic of Russia formed in 1924 out of the former regions of *Bukhara* and *Turkistan* and further सोमेश्वर in his मानसोल्लास (A.D. 1130) mentions तेजी horses among the best breeds of horses. It remains to be seen whether the terms ताजिक, तेजी, *Tazee, Tajik* are identical or otherwise. I intend to examine these terms in a separate paper with a view to clarifying the above confusion

---

1 Vide p. 615 of *World Pictorial Gazatteer* by J. A. Hammerton.

2 I propose to write a paper on *Persian Horses in Sanskrit literature* in which I shall record detailed evidence about Persian horses mentioned in Sanskrit texts and its bearing on the history of the import of Persian and Arabian horses in large numbers referred to in the *Bombay Gazatteer (Thana)* 1882 as follows:—(Page 431)—(810—1260 A.D.) *Trade Centres*—"The chief trade in Animals was towards the close of the period (1290), a great import of horses from the Persian Gulf and from Arabia. No ships came to Thana without horses.......This great demand for horses seems to have risen from the scare among the Hindu rulers of the Deccan caused by the Mussalman cavalry. As many as 10,000 horses a year are said to have been imported." (Yule's *Morco Polo*, II, 330.)

and hence cannot deal with them in this paper without detailed evidence.

For the present we may conclude that Nakula's *Aśva-cikitsita* is earlier than *C.A.D.* 1000 as king Bhoja has borrowed from it largely in the *Aśvayukti* section of his *Yuktikalpataru*, mentioning in one place the name of *Nakula* along with the extract borrowed.

THE MEMORABLE MESSAGE OF THE HELIODORUS COLUMN AT BESNAGAR.

K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR.

The Hindu scriptures have, sometimes, condensed their lofty ethical concepts and moral precepts in the form of triads of great significance. The Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad summed up its teaching with the three words Dama, Dāna and Dayā (self-control, charity, compassion) and proclaims it with the voice of thunder—

तदेतदैवषा दैवी वागनुवदति स्तनयित्नुः ददद इति–दाम्यत दत्त दय-ध्वमिति । तदेतत् त्रयं शिक्षेत् दमं दानं दयामिति ।

(Bṛah. up. 5-2-3)

The Bhagavadgītā in its last chapter lays down succintly the duty of every man in the three words Yajña, Dāna and Tapas. It explains clearly their connotation and ethical significance and sums up in these three the precepts which should regulate him in his moral relations with Divinity, his fellowmen and his own self.

यज्ञदापतपःकर्म न त्याज्यं कार्यमेव तत् ।
यज्ञं दानं तपश्चैव पावनानि मनीषिणाम् ।

In the scriptures of other religion also, for example, in the Bible, we find St. Paul delivering his message in the three words hope, faith and charity: 'And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three, but the greatest of them is charity'. (Corinthians, chaps. 13.)

We find another remarkable instance in the memorable inscription in the Heliodorus column. It is found written on a fine granite pillar erected at the instance of a Greek ambassador, Heliodorus, son of Dios, at Besnagar, a place 30 miles north-east by east of Bhopal, near Bhilsa, Gwalior State. It is worthwhile to refer in full to the translation of this inscription which is as follows:—This Gurudadhvaja of the God of gods, Vāsudeva, has been made at the instance of Holiodorus a Bhāgavata, son of Dios, from Takṣasilā, who having constrained his senses, arrived in the company of Chandadasa, the king of the family of Bhagabadra, the saviour, Kāsīputra, the son

of a lady belonging to Kautsa Gotra, of increasing glory, the vassal king of the Mahārāja Antialkidas, pledges himself to the three (cardinal virtues), the observance of which leads to immortality, *viz.*, 'Dama, Tyāga, Apramāda'. The original of the last portion of the inscription is as follows:—

(1) Trīṇi amṛtapadāni-(su)-anuthitāni

(2) nayaṃti svaga Dama chāga apramāda.

The pillar and the inscription were discovered by Sir John Marshal who gave an account of it in J.R.A. S. (Vol. 9, 1908). The last lines were further elucidated by great Oriental scholars, Dr. Fleet, Dr. Barnett (*vide* J.R.A.S., Vol. 9, 1053, 1093) and others. The three virtues mentioned have been translated by them as self-control, charity, and diligence respectively. Their significance has been discussed to some extent by Dr. Barnett. The word 'Apramāda', he says, is found mentioned in the Dhammapada. In regard to Tyāga he says 'the whole thing is discussed at length in the Bhagavadgītā, chapter 18.' But these scholars have not found out the Hindu scripture where this triad is mentioned and explained. As I read the inscription, I felt that a śloka containing a mention of the three virtues in similar terms might be found in our Hindu epics or Upaniṣads, especially, as it is said that the pillar is erected as a dedication to Vāsudeva by one who, though a Greek (yavana) has been imbued with Hindu culture and calls himself hence a Bhāgavata. I read through the chapters of the Mahābhārata and lighted upon a verse in the Sanatsujātīya chapters in the Udyoga Parvan which is very strikingly similar to the last lines of the inscription. The verse runs thus:

दमस्त्यागोऽप्रमादश्च एतेष्वमृतमाहितम् ।
तानि सत्यमुखान्याहुर्ब्राह्मणा ये मनीषिणः ॥

(see Mahābhārata, Kumbakonam edn. Udyoga Parvan, Sanatsujatīya, Adhyaya 3, verse, 23; P. P. S. Sastri edn. ch. 42). In the succeeding verses 24 to 36, the significance of the three is fully explained and the qualities denoted by them are enumerated. A perusal of these verses will make the reader fully realise the lofty significance of the three words for the first time, Dama, Tyāga, and Apramāda and the noble inspiring ideals denoted by them and the memorable message contained in this inscription worthy of perpetuation for all time in this permanent way by the granite pillar by a foreigner who came into contact with Hindu civilization in its palmy days and was

deeply touched by the fundamental core of the teachings of Hindu scriptures and the wise sayings of India's great Seers.

The inscription says that the three form the foundation for immortality. So does Sanatsujāta also declare. Sanatsujāta further elucidates the qualities denoted by the three. It is remarkable to note that the virtues indicted by the word 'Dama' begin with Satya, truth, and end with Ahimsā, non-violence. The other sixteen between the two are Apaiśuna, Atṛṣṇā, Aprātikūlya, Atamaḥ, Arati, Lokādveṣa, Anabimāna, Avivāḍa, Aprāṇipīḍana, Aparivāda, Anativāda, Aparitāpa, Kṣamā, Dhṛti, Siddhi, Apāpakṛtya. Tyāga is said to comprise three virtues, generosity to the needy and to one's own family, charity, *i.e.*, gifts to the Gods in Yajñas and to public utility, and thirdly renunciation of desires. Apramāda is defined as composed of eight qualities, namely Satya (Truth), Dhyāna, (contemplation), Samādhāna (Inward Peace), Codya (Philosophic enquiry), Vairāgya (Desirelessness), Asteya (freedom from theiving), Brahmacarya (Sexual purity), Aprigraha (Poverty). In the begining of the chapter, Sanatsujāta has further declared that Apramāda is itself Immortality while Pramāda is Mṛtyu or death. (See ch. 42, verse 4.) Thus we see that the inscription reveals a memorable message containing the quintessence of India's loftiest teachings.

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

SECOND FOUNDATION DAY.

The second Foundation Day of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, was celebrated on Sunday, September 1st, 1946, at the Ranade Hall, Mylapore. There was a large and distinguished audience.

Dr. Sir. Rm. Alagappa Chettiar, M.A., D. Litt., L.L.D., Bar-at-law, presided; Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar delivered the Foundation Day address.

Srī A. Shanmukha Mudaliar, M.A., one of the Secretaries, read messages received from learned institutions, scholars and men of public importance:—

Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, Poona, retiring President, All India Oriental Conference, wished the function every success, and the Institute a glorious career. He also enrolled himself as a Life Member of the Institute.

Dr. S. M. Katre, Director, Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Poona, wished the function a great success.

Srimant Pantsaheb Pratinidhi, Rajah Saheb of Aundh, a Life Member of the Institute, wished the function every success.

Dewan Bahadur S. Aravamuda Aiyangar, Member, H.E.H. the Nizam's Executive Council, Hyderabad, a Life Member of the Institute, wished all success to the function.

Sri M. S. Aney, Govt. of India Representative in Ceylon, a Life Member of the Institute, wished success.

Sri S. T. G. Varadacharya, M.A., Principal, Narasimha Sanskrit College, Chittugudur, Masulipatam, a Life Member of the Institute, said in the course of his message:

'Much as I wish to be present on the happy occasion of the foundation day of the Research Institute founded in the name of my revered Professor, I cannot do so........May the following stanza serve as my representative then.

स किंविमर्शो दृढबद्धमूलः तलस्पृशा यो न परिश्रमेण ।
इतीदमुद्घोषयतात्सभासौ नाम्ना स्थिता देशिकदिग्गजस्य ॥

"It is false research which is not firmly based upon deep study—May this Institute which stands in the name of the prince among professors proclaim this."

Sri K. Subramanyam, Mylapore, had also sent a message.

Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar, one of the Secretaries, presented the Report of the Institute's work for the year 1945-1946. Grateful tribute was paid by him to the service rendered by the first President, the late Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri to the Institute.

Sri T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, C.I.E., President of the Institute, in welcoming Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar and Dr. Sir Alagappa Chettiar, referred to Dr. Chettiar's high educational attainments, wide cultural interests and munificent benefactions.

THE FOUNDATION DAY ADDRESS.

Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar then delivered the Foundation Day address. He said:

"When my friend Mr. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar requested me to deliver the Address on the occasion of the Founder's Day of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, I readily consented to do so not because I have any pretentions to any learning in Sanskrit but because of the veneration in which I held Professor Kuppuswami Sastri during his lifetime, and of myself being given the opportunity to pay my tribute to the memory of the late Professor. The name of Professor Kuppuswami Sastri is closely associated with the renaissance of Sanskrit culture in this part of India, a culture which has been the bedrock of Hindu civilisation in its different phases and the fountain source from which all the great religious teachers of India whether in the Dravida country or in the Northern India derived their inspiration.

The career of Professor Kuppuswami Sastri reminds us of a lesson gatherable from the lives of great men, that it is possible that the services of a genius in art, literature or science might be lost to a country if talent is not discovered and given encouragement in the proper time. After a period of continued study in different Sastras under eminent scholars and great Pandits in the orthodox and traditional style and after graduating in the S. P. G. College, it is interesting to note that he entered service as a clerk in the Board of Revenue on Rs. 25

which was considered to be a good start in a Government office for a graduate in those days. Even during the period he was employed as a clerk, he was devoting himself to further studies in Sanskrit literature and the Sastras and during his leisure hours he was giving religious discourses to people interested in higher Sanskrit studies in Mylapore. The ease with which he handled recondite questions in Advaita Philosophy attracted the attention of the late Mr. V. Krishnaswami Aiyar who had the unerring instinct to discover talent wherever it might be lurking and bring out what was best in it. Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyar appointed him as the first Principal of the Madras Sanskrit College. One is reminded of the choice of Professor Sir Raman and Sir S. Radhakrishnan by the late Mr. Justice Austosh Mukerji to the chair of Physics and Philosophy respectively, a choice which has not a little contributed to the great place which India is occupying in the scientific and philosophical world at the present day. In that capacity he came in contact with some of the best Pandits in Sanskrit who were appointed to fill the different chairs in the Sanskrit College, Mylapore. Professor Kuppuswami Sastri successively held with great distinction the Principalship of the Madras Sanskrit College and the Tiruvadi Sanskrit College and in the year 1920, he was called upon to fill the Professorship of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the Presidency College in succession to the late Professor Rangachari, a post which was held by eminent Sanskritists from the inauguration of the Sanskrit Chair in the College. As Professor of Sanskrit he came into intimate contact with the University, was a member of the Senate, the Academic Council and the President of the Board of Studies and Examiners in the Madras University. He was also external examiner to several other Universities in India and was intimately connected with them. In the reorganisation of University studies after the passing of the new University Act, he was mainly responsible for giving a new orientation and direction for Sanskrit studies in the University of Madras. The Siromani courses on the traditional lines, the Oriental Title degrees in this University, the Sanskrit Honours syllabus were all fashioned by him. As an acknowledged authority in linguistics he was responsible for the institution of the course in Comparative Philology. He was loath to leave the subject of Oriental Research and the exploration of ancient classics by the application of Western methods of research and scholarship to western

scholars, who labour under the evident disadvantage of not being able to get into the genius and spirit of Indian culture. He was keen on the establishment of a school of Oriental Research which without in any way sacrificing the profundity and learning characteristic of our ancient Pandits, will utilise that scholarship for the promotion of research and historical criticism. He was responsible more than any other for the establishment of the Oriental Research Institute at the Madras University and the starting of a Journal of Oriental Research in Madras in which could be garnered contributions from all savants in Oriental literature.

His scholarship was not confined to any single branch of Sanskrit studies. It is not often that you find in a single professor or Pandit a combination of profound knowledge and learning in Kavya, Vyakarana, Mimamsa, Vedanta and modern scholarship. But Professor Kuppuswami Sastri's range of knowledge extended over every branch of Sanskrit studies. The question has been sometimes put as to how it is that with such profound learning he did not leave many works of note. The answer is two fold. (1) He set such a high standard for any work emanating from him and he applied such a searching criticism to his own work that the completion of the work according to his standard took an immeasurably long time. One is reminded of the great learning of Lord Acton and the incomplete works and notes which he left behind. (2) Professor Kuppuswami Sastri was to a large extent inspired by the ideals which distinguished the early teachers and Pandits of India. It is in the great tradition of India from the time of the Upanishads that the main work of a scholar and a seer is in the learning which he imparts to others and in the number of savants and Pandits whom he initiates and gives to the world. That is why I believe *Nitya-Adhyayana* and the inculcating of knowledge to others are both enjoined as a religious duty by our ancient scriptures. To impart learning to others and to train a band of scholars is the tradition of the Upanishads. That is the tradition of Greek scholars and painters. The world knows Gaga Batta through Nilakantha, the author of the Vyavahara Mayukha, Socrates and his sayings only through Plato, the great Buddha himself through the Jataka stories as narrated by his disciples and latterly Sri Ramakrishna Paramahamsa through Vivekananda.

Today are scattered over the length and breadth of South India eminent Pandits and Sanskrit scholars, who sat under the feet of the Professor. What probably the world of letters has lost, the Pandit world has gained.

Before I close, I should like to refer to one other trait in the Professor's scholarship. The Professor spoke and lectured in Sanskrit with a remarkable facility which made men feel that there is no point in the oft-repeated statement that Sanskrit was a dead language. The lucidity of his diction and the clarity of his pronunciation enabled even a person with a smattering knowledge of Sanskrit to follow him.

I would close these few disjointed remarks of mine with the following observations. While no institution at the present day can flourish without public support and financial assistance rendered by Government, it is as well to remind ourselves on this occasion that what makes for the success of any institution is dedication of service to its aims and ideals, a band of scholars and Pandits imbued with the spirit of research and scholarship, a determination on the part of its votaries to get rid of the shackles of idle pedantry and effete antiquarianism."

This was followed by the reading of two short Research Papers by Rao Sahib Prof. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai and Dr. V. Raghavan on the Śilappadikāram and Dara Shikoh's *Majma-ul-Bahrain*, the texts of which are published below.

DR. SIR ALAGAPPA CHETTIAR'S ADDRESS.

Rising amidst cheers, Sir Alagappa Chettiar thanked Mr. Venkatarama Sastriar for his kind references, and regretted that it had become the fashion now-a-days to refer to the Classics as a dead language. Sanskrit literature was their great Classic, and it was the good fortune of India to possess it.

People of all ages felt that the Classics were contemporary and could never be out of date. The Classics contained those imperishable, undying and eternal values, and had given expression to truth, goodness and beauty, and their values could never change. The Classics were an unerring guide and proper corrective to the mind's attitude towards life.

Proper understanding and perspective could be achieved only by a study of the Classics, and the Classics were in abundance in this country and Institutes like the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute would give ample opportunities to many students.

Continuing, Sir Alagappa Chettiar said that there was a great duty cast upon scholars and societies to popularise the Classics without losing their fundamental values.

In attempting to popularise the Classics and make them appeal to the masses they must not lose the sense of the very great values which were embedded in the Classics.

Everyone of them should consider it his sacred duty to understand the Classics. Prof. Kuppuswami Sastriar represented a combination of the scholarly dignity of a Pandit and also of modern culture. South India must be proud that it had such a great figure after whom this Institute was founded.

Sir Alagappa Chettiar said that they were grateful to foreign scholars, like Professor Max Muller, who had made a deep study of their Classics and had contributed much to Hindu thought and ideas.

He understood that, at the Peace Conference, attempts were made to get old manuscripts in Yugoslavia and Germany, and he hoped that attempts would be made to secure the other ancient manuscripts as well.

As Prof. Kuppuswami Sastriar combined in himself the deep and penetrating study of a great scholar of the past and a comparatively wide study of modern knowledge, he was in a position to make a rational approach to the great Classics, and if they were to profit in their researches into the Classics, that rational approach had to be maintained. Prof. Kuppuswami Sastriar had given them a blue-print for research into the Classics, and they must take advantage of that blue-print. He wished them all success. He hoped that the Institute would give opportunities for scholars, not only in this part of the country, but from other parts of India as well.

Sir Alagappa Chettiar regretted that even in these days, they were not able to find enough money for researches. He hoped that contributions would flow in, and the Institute would grow from strength to strength.

Mr. K. Balasubrahmania Ayyar proposed a vote of thanks.

SILAPPADIKARAM

RAO SAHIB S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI, B.A., B.L.
(*Reader in Tamil, University of Madras*)

The Śilappadikāram is one of our great classics and deals with the well-known story of Kōvalan and Kaṇṇaki. Traditionally, it is held to be one of the Pañcakāvyas, the other four being the Cintāmaṇi, the Maṇimēkhalai, the Vaḷaiyāpati and the Kuṇḍalakēśi. Of these, the Maṇimēkhalai is closely connected with the Śilappadikāram and is, in fact, a sequel to the latter kāvya, the heroine being the daughter of Kōvalan by his mistress, Mādhavi. Hence these two kāvyas have been styled by some modern writers as the twin-epics, the epic of the anklet and the epic of the jewelled girdle. No doubt, 'epic' is a misnomer in this connection. Iḷaṅgovaḍigaḷ and Kūlavāṇikan Śāttanār, their respective authors are necessarily contemporaries, since they are credited to have set their seal of approval on each other's kāvya, as soon as composed.

The Śilappadikāram was published in its entirety in 1892 by the late Dr. V. Swaminatha Iyer. But even before this, the kāvya had gained some publicity. The hon'ble Mr. P. Kumaraswami of Ceylon had pointed out that Gajabāhu mentioned in the kāvya must be identical with Gajabāhu I of the Ceylonese chronicle, Mahāvaṃśa. This king, according to Geiger, the editor of the chronicle, ruled for twenty-two years from 171 A.D. Following the wake of Mr. Kumaraswami, Mr. V. Kanagasabai Pillai, the famous author of 'The Tamils 1800 years ago', fixed the date of Śenkuṭṭuvan, the king of the Sangam period and contemporary of Gajabāhu. This contemporaneity was considered to be vouched for by a statement in text that its author was the younger brother of Śenkuṭṭuvan. The Śilappadikāram and the Maṇimēkhalai were thus assigned to the latter half of the 2nd century A.D. The authors were believed to have dealt with contemporaneous events in their works. Thus, a definite foothold for the date of the third Tamil Sangam was considered to have been secured. This was held to be the sheet-anchor upon which the chronological system of the ancient Tamil literature solely depended. Hence scholars and historians were eagerly looking forward to an authoritative edition of the text and commentaries of this classic. And

Dr. Swaminatha Iyer, the ablest editor of the day, supplied this desideratum.

The historical interest of the kāvya over-shadowed, for a time, its literary excellences. The fascinating beauty of the story, the charm of narration, the powerful dramatic situations tense with emotion, the lyrical quality of the songs, the limpid style, the melody of the verses, the felicity of diction—all these contributing to the magnificence of the poem, had to wait for recognition till the more imperious needs of the antiquarian were fully satisfied. Even the ordinary man in the street shared his enthusiasm. It was thought that the antiquity of the Tamils and of their literature depended entirely upon the date assigned to this kāvya. And the protagonists of the 2nd cent. theory maintained their position with a tenacity rarely equalled. Any scholar who had the audacity to doubt this was held to be a bitter enemy of the Tamils and traitor in the camp. So it was not a simple historical problem at all that the critical scholar had to face. He had to deal with a complicated mental state which would easily lead to communal hatred. Naturally there were acrimonious controversies. And instances were not wanting where these were sought to be set at rest by unanimous resolutions of learned societies, fixing the date of the kāvya and condemning those who dared to dissent. A short way, indeed, of settling historical and literary problems ! No need for elaborate studies, no need for investigation and research and no need for weighing evidence !

Dr. Hultzsch and Rao Bahadur Venkayya, whose reputation in the field of archaeology and South Indian history was of the highest, were the first to regard this date of Śilappadikāram with some degree of scepticism. Mr. K. V. Subramania Iyer, in his 'Historical sketches of Ancient Dekhan', brought forward some arguments in support of this sceptical position. Recently, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri tackled this problem and has come to the conclusion that it must be a late work. I have also dealt with this problem in some of my contributions and arrived at the same result. I do not intend to follow this controversy in this short paper; but I do want that the main position must be understood clearly. The crucial point is whether Iḷaṅgōvaḍigaḷ was narrating contemporaneous events in his great poem. If this is not proved, then the date of the poem may be far later. I shall content myself here with saying that there are very strong grounds to believe

that the events were not contemporaneous with the author. Naccinārkiniyar says definitely that the kāvya embodies a story of olden times. It would interest you to know that the late Prof. Kuppusawami Sastri, in whose honour and memory this Research Institute had been founded, helped the solution of the problem by proving a late date for the Maṇimēkhalai. His main reason was that the 29th canto of this work was a literal translation of a section in Nyāyapravēśa of Diṅnāga, the Buddhist logician of the 5th century A.D. Necessarily therefore, the so-called twin-epics must have been composed later than this date. Other evidences point to the conclusion that the 8th cent. A.D. is the most probable date of the kāvya. This is not to deny the synchronism of Senkuṭṭuvan and Gajabāhu and it must be clearly borne in mind that the date of the 3rd Sangam is not in the least affected by the above conclusion. The Sangam age might very well be the 2nd century A.D. In fact, any sober and unbiased enquiry can only lead to this result. Most probably, Illaṅgōvaḍigaḷ gave currency in his work to a genuine tradition about the synchronism, referred to above.

The chronology is helpful in making the milieu of the poem better understood. Let us turn to the poem itself and study its historical background. The ancient Tamils, in whatever field they might have achieved distinction, were not born story-tellers. They were of a hardy race and their character made for a union of strength, tenderness and fidelity. They concerned themselves mainly with the practical and immediate affairs of life. The Sangam literature bear ample testimony to this fact and the realistic spirit that pervades it precludes any possibility of a romantic tale. The earliest tale, of which there is any evidence, is the story of the Mahābhārata. The establishment of a Tamil Sangam at Madura and the translation of the Mahābhārata into Tamil were the two achievements ascribed to an ancient king, in an early inscription. Thus, it was from the Āryans of the North that the art of story-telling found its way into the Tamilagam. The Tamil poet of that age had no elaborate traditional art, no repertory of ancestral tales as famillar to his hearers as to himself and no audience composed of the best in the land. Centuries passed. And with the passage of time, the Āryan contact became closer and more intimate. Their religion with its elaborate ceremonials caught the fancy of the people. The Tamil kings performed Rājasūya

and other vedic sacrifices and one king was called Pal-yāgasālai-mudukuḍumi-peruvaḷudi, the great Pandya king of many sacrificial halls. Adherents of heretical religions also, the Buddhists and the Jains, imigrated in great numbers and mass conversion began. Emphasis on ethics was the dominant note of these religions and several didactic poems, known as Kīḻkaṇakku works were, in consequence, produced. It may be easily seen that ethics is hardly the soil in which romance and story-telling can flourish. Ceremonial religion soon asserted itself and led to a religious revivalism. Hymnal literature was the natural and direct result. Again, ceremonialism brought in its train the cultivation of several arts including dancing. Controversies also raged amongst the vedic religionists, the Jains and the Buddhists; and the result was an assiduous cultivation of the science of logic. Puranic lore increased by leaps and bounds. The Tamilian society imbibed more and more the Aryan culture and civilization. Cities and temples grew in numbers. The Northern India became more familiar and the great Sanskrit literature began to exercise its potent spell on the unsophisticated Tamil mind. In this milieu tales began to appear. But Sanskrit originals were taken and rendered into Tamil verse. Udayanan-peruṅgadai, evidently based on the Sanskrit version by Durvinīta of Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhatkathā may be cited as an instance. This tale, of which a major portion has been recovered and edited by the late Dr. V. Swaminatha Iyer, may be reasonably assigned to circa 700 A.D.

The most notable feature of this romantic tale is its metre. A kind of continuous verse known as 'ahaval'—and not stanza—is employed in this work. This metre has a noble tradition from the very beginning of Tamil literature and is indigenous to the Tamil language. The nearest equivalent of this verse is the Blank verse in English. No metre corresponding to this exists in the Sanskrit language. Perfected through centuries by the great masters of language, enriched with the phrases and formulas of generations of older poets, and endowed with a loveliness that ravishes our heart, it is a splendid medium of poetic speech. The witchery o the author's art, his stylistic perfection and the sensuous beauty of his diction secure for him a place next only to Iḷaṅgōvaḍigal and Kamban. But he composed a romance and however much it may appeal to our sense of wonder and of beauty, its appeal to our heart is limited.

The sense of unreality damps our soul and we are left only with a chill admiration for the poet.

Following this Jain poet, a Buddhist author, Śāttanār, wrote the Maṇimēkhalai, a religious romance. There is, in this work, too much of religion and too much of dogma to render of it of any value as a romantic tale. The style and diction are far from attractive, but the metre employed is again ahaval. Generally speaking, it is an inferior poem in every respect. But its chief interest lies in the fact that it is a work contemporaneous with the Śilappadikāram.

The latter kāvya composed shortly after Maṇimēkhalai deals, as already said, with a well-known story. Kōvalan and Kaṇṇaki, its hero and heroine, belong to two rich Vaiśya families of Kāviripūmpaṭṭinam. After a short wedded life with Kaṇṇaki, Kōvalan deserts her, falls in love with Mādhavi, a courtesan and loses all his wealth in the pursuit of pleasure. A few years later, he suspects the fidelity of his mistress and returns to his faithful wife in a repentant mood. Both leave their home for Madura, with the hope of retrieving their fortune in this ancient city. But fate decrees otherwise. While trying to sell one of the anklets of his wife, he is caught by the machinations of a wicked goldsmith, brought before the king and charged with the theft of the queen's anklet. The king, in a moment of forgetfulness, orders him to be put to death. Kaṇṇaki hearing of this, enters the palace and proves the innocence of her beloved Kōvalan. The king dies in grief. His queen also swoons and gives up her life. Kaṇṇaki, consumed with grief for her husband and seething with rage for the injustice, wrenches one of her breasts and throws it at the city of Madura. The city perishes in flames. Madurāpati, the guardian diety of Madura, appears before her and holds out a promise that she would meet her Kōvalan in his ethereal body on the fourteenth day. Driven by this hope, she rushes westward along the southern bank of the Vaigai and reaches Tiruc-cen-kōḍu. There, on the day of promise, Kōvalan descends in a celestial car and Kaṇṇaki, leaving this wicked world, joins her husband in the world of the immortals. Such, in brief, is the outline of the story in the first two Kāṇḍas. The third and last Kāṇḍa deals with the apotheosis of Kaṇṇaki and the consecration of an idol in her honour, by Śeṅkuṭṭuvan.

The story is indigenous to the soil. Even before the time of Iḷaṅgōvaḍigal, it must have reached its full growth.

For the Śilappadikāram is instanced as one of the class of works known as *Tonmai*. Echoes of the story are heard even in the Sangam age. The colophons to some of the Puranānūru poems speak of a Kaṇṇaki who was deserted by her lord Pēhan in favour of a mistress. Again we hear in Narrinai of a Tirumāvuṇṇi who, out of her unbearable grief for her estranged lover, wrenched out one of her breasts. We also learn of a poem, called Pattinippāṭṭu, in which a wife, finding her husband murdered, his arms torn off and his body in a pool of red blood, laments wildly. Probably out of these elements, the story grew and developed. Even after the time of Iḷangōvaḍigal, popular imagination played round the story and created several versions of it, differing from the original and from one another in great many details.

It may be noted that the story treats of a social evil, the institution of hetaerae. In sharp antithesis both to the fantastic romance and to the epic of national tradition, is this tale of a comparatively advanced society. Our sympathies are evoked and we feel we can enter into the varying moods of the several characters. The tragic situations are convincing realities. 'The poignancy of the tragedy is not somehow warded off; the tragic cry is not dissolved in a saintly ardour of suffering; the calamity does rightly come home'. The dramatic situations are never missed. The scene where Kaṇṇaki approaches the king's court and challenges his wisdom and justice grips our heart and we are overwhelmed with its tragic intensity. The poetic treatment of the story and the narrative manner need special mention. The style and diction compare very favourably with those of Udayanan-kathai. Judged by every standard, the Śilappadikāram is a noble work of art and the praise of our national poet, Bharati, is not at all misplaced.

The author may be charged with pedantry in his treatment of dance and music; but we are ever grateful to him for the details he has given of these sister-arts. We are now trying to revive them. Is it not our duty to understand the ideals of our fore-fathers in regard to these ancient arts?

A good modern edition of this noble kāvya and a good English translation of it are sad necessities. I hope scholars will address themselves to this task in the immediate future.

DARA SHIKOH'S MAJMA-UL-BAHRAIN

(*Samudra-Saṁgama-Grantha*)

DR. V. RAGHAVAN

In his Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit published by us on last year's Foundation Day, the late Professor in whose honoured name this Research Institute is founded, has emphasised the idea that Synthesis and Harmony formed not only the Highway of Sanskrit Literary criticism, but the very key to the understanding of Hinduism and Hindu culture. In his "Compromises in the History of Advaitic Thought" which we are publishing today, the Professor again says: " . . . . . in this way, by encouraging an ever-increasing stress on *Saṁvāda, Sampratipatti, Parasparabhāvanā*, mutual adjustments, mutual regard, and mutual concession, in the sphere of thinking, speaking and doing (manas, vāk, kāya); —thus, perhaps it is, that, all through the ages, the cultural life of India has been growing, with its distinctive features of absorption, tolerance, synthesis and accommodation." It is well-known to students of the history of Indian culture how the Ganges of of Hinduism had absorbed the waters of numerous tributaries and had grown into a mighty river; but it is not so well known that in its great efforts at synthesis and harmonising, it did not refrain from boldly comprehending the faith of the Prophet whose followers had come to this land, grown in numbers and made themselves part of this country. Few indeed will be the students of Indian History and culture in whom the present political ills of the country and more so the recent tragedy enacted in Calcutta would not have created again that wistful reflection 'How different would have been the course of Indian history had Dara Shikoh succeeded Shah Jehan to the Mogul gadi in Delhi and not Aurangazeb, had the new religious synthetic spirit inaugurated by Akbar the Great, the spirit which bloomed forth into greater efflorescence in his great-grandson Prince Dara Shikoh, had been allowed to reach its happy consummation of an Indo-Islamic unity, a consummation which is the ardent prayer and hope of every one of us meeting at the end of the holy Id.'

Prince Dara Shikoh was the eldest and beloved son of Shah Jehan; his more politically ambitious younger brother persecuted him, and to serve his ends, made the religious heads proclaim Dara an apostate to the faith of the Prophet and had him executed. After executing Dara, Aurangazeb accosted Sarmad, one of Dara's great Gurus, and asked him about his prophecy that Dara would succeed to Shah Jehan's throne; Sarmad, who knew his royal pupil so well, said "My prophecy has not proved false; God has given him eternal sovereignty." One of his masters, Mulla Shah, said that while Timur and Shah Jehan were kings of grandeur, Dara was king of the heart. Indeed, Dara prized not the throne of Delhi; born by the grace of the saint Mu'inuddin Chishti, and brought up amidst Hindu and Muslim mystics, Dara developed greater interest in spiritual realisation rather than in material aggrandisements. In his work Safinat-ul-Awliya which he wrote in his 28th year on his Sufi preceptor Miyan Mir, Dara, referring to his own revelation, says: "God has given thee that which no Emperor of the world has ever possessed." It is for this kingdom of the King of kings that Dara aspired and strove for.

Dara was initiated into the Qadiriya order of Sufis by Miyan Mir. He came into close contact with the greatest Sufi divines of his time and drank deep at the fountain of this exalted mysticism of the Sufis which arose within the fold of the Prophet's faith, much like the Vedānta within the fold of Vedic religion, and pioneers of which like Hosain Mansoor proclaimed, even as the Ṛshis of the Upanishads, the truth of *Anal Haq*, I am God, *Tat Tvam Asi.*

"Dara himself says in his short third work, the Risāla-i-Hak Numā, that God had vouchsafed to him *Tawhid* (तौहीद्) or *Divine Unity* and that at this stage of perfection there would remain no doubt that *Thou Art the Truth.* Rejecting the mere dogma of the orthodox priests, he, as a mystic, established himself in the path of personal spiritual experience, Anubhava. He was indeed a great scholar in his own religion, as well as in those of others, and shed much new light on many a passage in the holy Kuran, and as a contrast to his own great-grandfather, the sponsor of the eclectic *Din-i-Ilahi,* he personally wrote several spiritual treatises for the greater clarification of the understanding of himself and those near him; his work in comparative religion was far

more substantial; but all the time, as the dominating character of his writings show, his was not the spirit of a dry scholastic writer, but that of a genuine mystic; his books are not an exhibition of polemical minutae, but a treasure of spiritual gems, bearing the glow of Anubhava. In fact, Mullah Shah asked Dara to go forth as a teacher and impart spiritual instructions.

Two other works which Dara wrote as a Sufi, are (1) his first work written in his 25th year, the Safinat-ul-Awliya, in which he described the lives and greatness of about 411 saints and divines; and (2) a collection of Sufi aphorisms called Hasanāt-ul-Ārifin, in which he justifies the ecstatic utterances of himself and other Sufis, against the criticisms of the orthodox.

Like all mystics who revelled in the realisation of the one Truth, whatever its various denominations, Dara too fraternised with the mystics of other faiths. Bernier, the Christian traveller, refers in his Travels to Dara being a Christian with a Christian, and a Pandit and Sānnyāsin with the Brahmans of Benares. Dara sat in the Court Hall with his father when the great recluse Kavīndrācārya Sarasvatī of Benares, waited upon Shah Jehan for getting repealed the Pilgrim tax, *Jessia*, levied at the holy bathing places like Benares and Prayag by the Mogul kings, and in that connection expounded for several days the truths of Hinduism. Kavīndrācārya and Dara moved closely as we find from some Hindi songs of Kavīndra on Dara in manuscript in the Bikaner Library. There is a long Sanskrit letter which Dara Shikoh had addressed to a Hindu Sannyāsin, Goswami Nṛsiṁhāśrama Sarasvatī in which Dara pays his obisance to the same with the Nārāyaṇa-Aṣṭākṣara mantra:—

श्रीगोस्वामिनृसिंहाश्रमेषु प्रकटितपरामनन्दसन्दोहतत्त्वज्ञानदूरीकृतमहा-मोहसमवगतसप्तभूमिकासमारोहमहम्मददाराशिकोहकृता। ओंनमोनारायणायेति अष्टाक्षरमन्त्रपूर्वका नमस्काराः सन्ति ।

The Hindu mystic whom Dara sought most and whom he mentions more than once is Baba Lal Bairagi, whom he met at Lahore and whose spiritual conversations with the Prince are recorded in a book, compiled by his Secretary Chandar Bhau, called *Mukālima-i-Dārā Shikūh wa Bābā Lāl.* Dara's inclusion of Bābā Lāl in his work on the lives of the Muslim Saints shows the high esteem in which the Prince held this Hindu mystic.

From the company and the teachings of all these Hindu mystics, Dara became more and more initiated into the tenets of Hinduism, and began appreciating the essential unity of the two faiths. In his *Risāla-i-Hak Numa*, Dara expatiates upon the yogic practices of breath-control, Prāṇāyāma. It is an index of the height of Dara's spiritual ascent that, like advanced Advaitic saints, the Prince was greatly attracted to the Yogavāsiṣṭha which he also quotes in one of his treatises. There was already a Persian translation of this Sanskrit philosophical classic done at the instance of Akbar; but Dara did not find it good enough. He ordered a fresh and simple rendering, in whose preface he says that the work was undertaken by him at the instance of sage Vasiṣṭha and Prince Rāmacandra who appeared to him in a dream. Another work of Dara in this same direction is his Persian translation of the Bhagavad Gītā. Two years before his execution, he translated into Persian 50 Upaniṣads under the title *Sirr-i-Akbar* meaning *the Great Secret*, which formed the basis of a French and Latin translation of the Upaniṣads by a French traveller in 1801-2. Dara's preface to this Upaniṣad-translation is very important, for here he truly exalts the Hindu Upaniṣads: Now thus sayeth this griefless fakir, Muhammad Dara Shikoh . . . . As he had an ardent desire for seeing the God-knowing devotees of the various orders, and hear their high utterances regarding monotheism, he had read the various works on mysticism and had himself composed tracts, but in spite of this, his thirst for understanding *Tawhid* (Divine Identity), which is a vast ocean, was increasing more and more. . . . . There were many secrets concealed in the Holy Kuran and the Sacred Book whose interpreter it was difficult to find. So he, the author, desired to read all the revealed Books, for the utterances of God elucidate and explain one another. It may be that in one place it is found in compendium, while in others it may be given in detail, . . . He read the Old Testament and the New Testament and the Psalms of David and other scriptures but the discourse on Tawhid found in them was brief. . . . He then examined the religious works of the Hindus and found that the Upaniṣads were an ocean of monotheism. Hence he undertook to translate them with the help of Pandits and Sannyāsins of Benares. He adds that many a knotty point was solved by a reference to the Upaniṣads and viewed in this light it is the Upaniṣads, Dara says, that a verse of the Kuran refers to, as the Hidden

Book mentioned therein cannot be the Pslams, the Pentateuch or the Gospels.

With all his appreciation of Hinduism, Dara did not cease to be a follower of the path of the Prophet, a circumstance which adds to the value of his endeavours to harmonise the two religions. The result of his comparative study of these two religions, he embodied in a separate treatise called *Majma-ul-Bahrain,* meaning the Mingling of the Two Oceans, the two oceans of Hinduism and Islam. What is more interesting is that of this Persian work of his, he prepared a Sanskrit version called *Samudra-Saṁgama-Grantha,* the work on the mingling of the two oceans. Of this Sanskrit version of Dara's Majma-ul-Bahrain, there are only two manuscripts known so far, one in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, and another in the Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner; and I am engaged in studying the Sanskrit work and editing it critically on the basis of these two manuscripts which I have secured.*

Without going into the details of the contents of this important work, I shall give a bird's-eye view of its substance, as my attempt this evening has been to draw the attention of the general enlightened public to the importance of the great endevour of Dara Shikoh and its value for the culture and life of this country. As in his other works, here too Dara refers to himself as a man of realisation; he describes himself as one free from desire and dejection:

अथ कथयति वीतरागविगतशोकसंदोहो दाराशिकोहः ।

He says in the opening that in his desire to know in full the conclusions of the Vaidikas, he sought many Hindu mystics and chiefly through his guru Baba Lal, he attained siddhi in Tapas and Jñāna.

तदनु चैतद् विचारमध्ये प्रविष्टम् मया यदन्तं प्राप्नुयामाभिप्रायस्य सिद्धानां निश्चेतॄणां वैदिकानामनादिकुलजानामिति । अथ च कैश्चित्कैश्चिद् वैदिकैः सह, विशेषतः चैतन्यस्वरूपज्ञानमूर्तिसद्गुरुबाबालाल अन्तं तपस्याया ज्ञानस्य सौबुद्ध्यस्य ईश्वरप्राप्तेः शान्तेश्च प्राप्तवान् ।

* On seeing a Press report of this paper, Dr. Harshe of the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona, informed me of a third Ms. of the work in his own possession and has generously offered to place it at my disposal for my edition.

By his frequent contacts with Baba Lal he realised that the differences between Islam and Hinduism were verbal, not essential.

तेन च सह पुनःपुनः संगतीः गोष्ठीश्चाकरवं परिभाषाभेदातिरिक्तं कमपि भेदं स्वरूपावाप्तौ नापश्यम् ।

He then proceeded to harmonise the two faiths, and as in this work the oceans of two such faiths enshrining wisdom are brought together, he called the work the Union of the Two Oceans—

अतश्च द्वयोरपि एकवाक्यतामकरवम्.....ज्ञानिनोर्द्वयोरपि मत-समुद्रयोः इह संगम इति नाम चास्यापयं समुद्रसंगम इति ।

The great ones are of the opinion that the fruit of all philosophies must be enquiry into truth without any prejudice or intolerance; the great ones alone know how difficult it is to reach the heart of a faith, and they, possessed of knowledge, alone derive bliss from such findings and not those of stunted minds who see only differences. These findings of my own experience, I have set forth, Dara says, for the benefit of those belonging to me, and not for the ignorant folk of these two faiths who see differences:

इत्थं किलोपदेशो महानुभावानां यन्निर्मत्सरतया तत्त्वविवेचनं सकल-वेदान्तानां प्रयोजनम्, अतो यः कश्चिद्विवेकज्ञानी च स एव जानाति तत्त्वनिर्णयतलस्पर्शे कीदृशः श्रम इति । निश्चयेन विद्वांसो ज्ञानिनश्च बहुतरं सुखमितः प्राप्स्यान्ति, न प्राप्स्यन्ति च भेदवादिनः कुण्ठितमतय इति स्वानुभवानुसारेण च निर्णीय तत्त्वार्थं स्वकुटुम्बेष्वनुकंपया कृतोऽयमारंभः, न पुनरज्ञानिनोः विभिन्नमतसंबान्धिनोर्बोधनेन मम प्रयोजनमिति ।

From whatever quarter comes the message of Truth, I listen to it; and in this, Dara says, he derives his ability and aid only from God.

अत्र च परमेश्वरादेव मम सामर्थ्यं, परमेश्वर एव मम सहायः ।

Dara then proceeds to set forth his thesis of unity by dividing the subject into several sections, and pointing out the terminological as well as ideological identities between Hinduism and Islam. The following are the heads under which Dara emphasises the unity of the two faiths:

1. The 5 Elements. अथ नासिरापरपर्यायभूतव्याख्या ।
2. The 5 Senses. अथ इन्द्रियानि पञ्च ।

3. Contemplation and Spiritual Exercises. अथ ध्याननिरूपणम्। Dara mentions here the great yogic Vidyā called Ajapā japa, which every breathing indvidual does by the very act of his existence; and quoting the Kuran, points out that the Holy Kuran too mentions this Ajapā Vidyā only, though its reciters do not know this. In the Ajapā japa, the outgoing breath refers to सः and the inhaled breath to अहम्,—सोऽहम्,(अ)हं सः He is I, I am He. These two words सः and अहम् have their parallel in the Sufistic Hū Allāh, He is God.

तत्र यद्यपि सर्वश्वासनिरोधा नानाविधाः सिद्धैः उक्ताः, तथापि अजपां सर्वोत्कृष्टां वदन्ति, यत इयं जाग्रद्दशायां स्वप्नदशायां च स्वभावतः सर्वप्राणिनां सर्वदा संभवति । तदुक्तमस्मद्वेदे 'नास्ति किंचिद् ईदृशं वस्तु यत्परमेश्वर-जपं सर्वदा न करोति' इति । परन्तु भवन्तो न जानन्ति अनेन अजपाजप एवोक्तः । तस्योच्चारणे पदद्वयं कृतं - तत्र श्वासस्य उपरिगमने 'स' इति पदमाविर्भवति, नीचैरागमने 'अहम्' इति अस्यार्थः 'सोऽहम्' इति । अस्मदेकात्मवादिनोऽपि (i.e. the Sufis) श्वासक्रियायां 'हू अल्लाह' इति जानन्ति, श्वासस्योपरिगमने 'हू' इति, बहिरागमने 'अल्लाह' इति प्रकटीभवति ।

4. The 4th section deals with God's Attributes—
अथ परमेश्वरगुणव्याख्यानम् ।

5. Soul—अथ रूहापरपर्यायस्य आत्मनो निरूपणम् ।

6. Air—प्राणादिनिरूपणम् ।

7. The four Worlds or States जगच्चतुष्टयनिरूपणम् । Here Dara quotes from the Sanskrit work Bahmajñāna which is in the form of a dialogue between Mahādeva and Pārvatī.

Then Sound, Nāda—अथ शब्दनादयोर्व्याख्या ।

Here Dara deals with Om, the Praṇava.

8. Nūr or Light—प्रकाश

9. Realisation or Sākṣātkāra—अथ ईश्वरदर्शननिरूपणम् । Here Dara refers to a praiseworthy tenet of the Sunnis.

10. God's Names—
अथ नामानि निरूप्यन्ते

11. Men of realisation—
अथ सिद्धत्व-ऋषि-ईश्वरत्वनिरूपणम् ।

12. Quarters—Dik.

13. Earth—Pṛthivī. The seven lokas and Purāṇic geography are dealt with here.

14. The Great Deluge-Mahāpralaya. Dara quotes here the Yoga Vāsiṣṭha.

15. Salvation—अथ मुक्तिनिरूपणम् । Jīvanmukti and Videhamukhi, the Virāṭpuruṣa, the Ganges, Jumna and Sarasvatī as the three Nāḍīs, Ilā,, Piṅgalā and Śuṣumnā—are dealt with here.

16. Day and Night and Time.

अथ अहोरात्रस्य ब्रह्मणो गुप्तप्रकटतारूपस्य निरूपणम् ।

All through the work, we find Dara thoroughly at home in all the major and minor aspects of Hinduism; more prominent than his wide scholarship is his deep understanding and genuine spirit born of realisation. It is no vain claim that he makes at the end of this work that, prompted by his own self which is of the form of God Viṣṇu, he churned the Vedic ocean with the true and false impulses as the Gods and demons and his own mind as the churning mountain, Mandara, and brought out a gem of wisdom which excelled all the fourteen gems that the Devas and Asuras brought forth by churning the ocean.

विष्णुस्वरूपात्मन इच्छया स्वीयमनो मन्दरं कृत्वा संकल्पविकल्पान् देवदैत्यान् कृत्वा वेदसमुद्रं मथित्वा ज्ञानरत्नमेकमीदृशं निष्कासितं, यद् देवैर्दैत्यैश्च समुद्रमथनं कृत्वा निष्कासितेषु चतुर्दशरत्नेष्वपि न प्राप्तम् ।

It is sad indeed that the production of this work should have outraged Aurangazeb and his orthodox Mullahs, and bought upon Dara capital punishment. But may this gem of wisdom, of understanding and harmony, which Dara brought out of the two oceans of Islam and Hinduism, mingled on the sacred soil of India, be a treasure constantly cherished by the votaries of both faiths. My we build up again the bridge of understanding which Akbar raised and Dara completed, so that we may both put forth our energies together, सह वीर्यं करवावहै, may not hate each other, मा विद्विषावहै, and an united India may spread to the world the message of peace which both of us profess, the *Salam* with which one greets everybody and tbe *Śānti* with which the other concludes everything.

BOOK-REVIEW.

Dr. B. C. Law Volume. Pt. 1. Indian Research Institute Calcutta. Pt. 2. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona.

Dr. Bimala Churn Law is well-known as a Scholar-Patron, one who has contributed two hundred papers and forty books as a scholar, and more than a lakh and a half donation for educational and cultural purposes besides big sums for social services, etc. It is indeed fit that this Vidvat-Prabhu should have been honoured by the world of scholars with two sumptuous volumes of learned articles.

The volumes are edited by Drs. S. Bhandarkar, Barua, Ghosh and Profs. Nilakanta Sastri and Gode, and published by the Indian Institute, Calcutta and the Bhandarkar Institute, Poona. Extending to nearly 1,200 pages, these two volumes contain papers contributed by scholars from India and abroad, covering every branch of Indology, and numbering one hundred and nineteen. It is not possible or necessary to review or mention the contents of these articles; it is enough to emphasise that volumes such as these, besides the honour they do to a scholar, form a substantial addition to Indology and will continue to be reference books of permanent value.

V. Raghavan.

OBITUARY

Mahavidvan R. Raghava Iyengar.

The passing away of Mahavidvan Bhasha-Kavisekhara R. Raghava Iyengar on 11-7-46 has removed from our midst one of the greatest Tamil Scholars of all times. He enjoyed this unique distinction in no uncertain degree. Endowed with an intellect subtle and penetrating, a mind richly stored with ancient learning, a memory as prodigious as it was resourceful, and a gift of speech rarely equalled in recent times, Mr. Raghava Iyengar was indeed a power in the world of Tamil scholarship. That he should have captivated by his solid merits and sparkling brilliance, orators and thinkers like the late Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, Sir S. Varadachari and scholars

like Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastrigal is tribute enough. He was eager to discover talent and was generous and he encouraged younger men with his advice and guidance. His learning and knowledge were always available to all who sought his help.

He was adorning the Court of Ramnad as its Samsthana Vidvan for a good many years and the outside world had to content itself with occasional glimpses of this great man. What brought him into direct contact with the general public was his literary activity in connection with the Madura Tamil Sangam. He was the first editor of the *Sen Tamil*, the premier Tamil literary journal of our Presidency. Under his guidance, this literary journal rose like a meteor in reputation and in those years there was scarcely an issue of that journal which did not bear the stamp of his genius. He was a pioneer in literary and historical research. The several articles contributed by him reveal his profound scholarship, his critical acumen and his remarkable powers of analysis and exposition. His lectures on Kambaramayanam were marvels of scholarship and oratory and drew phenomenal crowds of admirers from near and far, to listen spell-bound and enthralled.

In an august assembly of Pandits and scholars gathered at the Sanskrit College, Mylapore, on the occasion of a Valmiki Day celebration of the Sanskrit Academy, Madras, in 1930, the late Mm. Karunkulam Krishna Sastrigal, Principal, in his great enthusiasm, presented him with a shawl.

Quite late in life he was appointed Head of the Research Department in Tamil of the Annamalai University and he discharged his duties with rare distinction. He was the author of several works in Tamil, the chief among them being Pārikāthai, an original poem, a translation of Śākuntala and a research work on the History of Tamil. Further he has written a learned commentary on Kurunthokai and a verse translation of the Bhagavadgītā (both await publication). The latter was read and expounded by him to a large and appreciative audience of the Sanskrit Academy at the Ranade Hall, Mylapore, and later, the Sanskrit Academy honoured him with the title "Bhaṣākaviśekhara." The Tamil world today mourns the loss of this profound scholar with a poet's soul.—*S. Vaiyapuri Pillai and P. N. Appuswami.*

We are sorry to learn that *Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit*, Retd. Director-General of Achaeology, Govt. of India, passed

away in Poona on Aug. 12th '46. He had made many excavations and expositions of the Indus Valley Civilization.

Another noted Archaeologist whom the world of Indologists lost recently is *Dr. Hirananda Sastri*, formerly of the Archaeological Dept. of India and then Director of Archaeology, Baroda State.

Panditaraja K. Rama Pisharoti of Cochin passed away on October 3rd 1946. He was a scholar of great attainments in Sāhitya, Vyākaraṇa and Nyāya. The Paṇḍitarāja wrote erudite commentaries on many Sanskrit classics, the Śākuntala, Mālavikāgnimitra, the Śukasundeśa, the Nārāyaṇīya and the Dhvanyāloka.

On October 30th, 1946, *Prof. H. H. Dodwell* died in London at the age of 67. A member once of the Indian Educational Service from 1908-22 and a Joint Editor of the Cambridge History of India, he was Professor of History of India in the London School of Oriental Studies. With F. Price, he was Joint Editor of the English Translation of the Private Diary of Anandarangam Pillai, published by the Government of Madras (1904-28).

In the passing away of *Mahamahopadhyaya Kapay Ramachandrachar* of Kumbakonam, on December 12th 1946 the world of Sanskrit Panditas has become poor. He was 79 at his death. An authority on Dvaita Vedanta and the Mahabharata and Sri Bhagavata, he was a very popular expounder of the Epics and Puranas.

On November, 12th 1946, the whole nation was in mourning on hearing of the passing away of the great Hindu, scholar and statesman, patriot, orator and educationist, *Pandit Madan Mohan Malavya*, the founder of the Benares Hindu University. His passing away is an irreparable loss to Hindu culture and Sanskrit learning, as much as to Indian nationalism.

In the death of *Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar*, the field of historical research has lost a pioneer in South Indian history. An author of a number of articles, monographs, books and editions, Dr. Ayyangar died full of years as well as honours. He had held University Professorships, delivered Endowment Lectures, presided over both the Oriental Conference and the History Congress and received many other

distinctions. He was also editing for many years the Journal of Indian History.

On January 16th, 1947, *Pandit P. S. Anantanarayana Sastri* of Cochin passed away. By his death, Kerala has lost one more of its erudite Pandits. Sri Sastri was a sound Vaiyakarana and besides several text books, had edited also the grammatical work Praveśaka.

On February 14th, 1947, Sri D. Balasubramanya Ayyar, a life-member of the K. S. R. I., passed away. Through the B. G. Paul & Co., of which he was the Proprietor, he published many Research works on Vijayanagar History, Kadambas etc. Through the Kamakoti Kosasthana of which he was the Founder-Secretary, he published a number of Sanskrit hymns with English and Tamil translations.

INDIAN CULTURE ESSAY COMPETITION

THE BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN invites original essays on any aspect of Bharatiya Samskriti (Indian Culture) written in Sanskrit, Hindi or English for the annual Essay Competitions which have been started in 1942. This year six gold medals (each of the value of Rs. 150) and six silver medals (each of the value of Rs. 25) are to be awarded. One gold medal and one silver medal will be awarded to the best and second best essay respectively received under each of the groups mentioned below. The branches of study given below in brackets are neither exhaustive divisions of the groups nor topics for essays in themselves, but are intended only to give a general idea of each group to a layman.

(1) Religion and Philosophy (Buddhistic, Jaina, Nyaya-Vaisheshika, Samkhya yoga, Vedanta, Mimamsa, Vyakarana etc.).

(2) Art and Architecture (Brahmanical, Buddhist, Jaina, etc.).

(3) Languages, Literature (Samskrita, Prakrita, Apabhramsha, Modern Indian Vernaculars, etc.), Linguistics and Literary Criticism.

(4) History (Political).

(5) Social and Economic Order.

(6) One gold and one silver medal have been specially donated for the best and next best essay on "Bhagavad Gita and Life".

ACTIVITIES OF THE ECOLE FRANCAISE D' EXTREME ORIENT DURING 1940-1945.

By Mlle. S. Karpeles

French Information Bureau, 27, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.

During the period of war this institution was unable to send her Bulletin to her members, correspondents and to the scientific institutions with which it was on exchange terms. At present, owing to post-war difficulties its secretariat has been temporarily established in Saigon. It is from the Cochin-Chinese capital that a most interesting booklet, summarising all the activities of this institute from 1940 to 1945 has just been published. After reading it, one may conclude that the E. F.E.O has been more fortunate than similar institutions in the Far East, as it has been able to carry on all its activities in different fields and brought out substantial studies for the benifit of many scholars.

The Bulletin which appeared during the above mentioned period, is, at present, stored up in Hanoi. Full of hope in the future and trusting that soon these publications will once again become, as it was in the past, the strong cultural link between the other world scientific institutions, the Secretariat thought it advisable to issue, meanwhile, this booklet. The few extracts given here are specially intended for the Indian elite.

Necrology

Victor Goloubew, well known in India for his different works on Indian art and studies, died in Hanoi in 1945.

Madeleine Calani, the great prehistorian scholar for Indo-China, died in Hanoi in 1943.

Georges Grosluer, well known for his studies on Khmer art and civilisation, died in Phnom Penh Cambodia in 1945, after having been cross-examined by Japanese armed police.

Library

The opening of the new five-storied building took place in March 1943; amongst the cataloguing work carried on, one must mention the preparation of a detailed catalogue concerning all the 16th, 17th, and 18th century European works on Asia that the library of the E.F.E.O. possesses. Most of them are rare specimens and form a valuable collection not only by the number of volumes but also on account of the importance of

their authors, thus brought to light. This work has been undertaken by M. Destombes who delivered an interesting nautical lecture last year in Calcutta.

Museums

Owing to the rich result of the researches carried out by Madeleine Colani and M. Paul Levy in the prehistoric field, ***the museum of Hanoi*** possesses valuable prehistorical collections. One hall is devoted for general prehistory and the other one to Indo-Chinese prehistory. Owing to the events of 1945 the exhibit of the Ethnographical collections had to be postponed.

The Saigon Museum has now many pre-Angkorean pieces of sculpture thanks to the researches undertaken by Mr. Malleret in Cochin-China. Among the masterpieces found one must mention 3 seated Buddhas, two standing wooden Buddhas, a Lokeśvara with the characteristic pre-Khmer arch of support, a Sūrya, a Viṣṇu, 2 feminine statuettes, not to mention the rich collections of articles that the OC-EO excavations have given.

Preservation of historical monuments

In Annam the natural site of the Misan "Cham" group monument has been converted into an "archaeological park".

In Cambodia up to the 9th March 1945 the work has progressed regularly in the archaeological fields. The "anastylos" of an important monument has been completed and another much advanced. The consolidation of Bayon's towers is finished, the northern gate at the entrance of Angkor Thom, with its highway edged on both sides by giants has been entirely restored and the same work is being undertaken at the southern gate. Many other restorations and consolidations of minor monuments and site have also been undertaken.

In Laos, the famous "Vat Prahkeo" of Vientiane which may be considered as the "Palladium" of the Laotian people, has been entirely restored in 1942.

Research Publications

Mr. Paul Levy, who during January 1946 delivered several lectures in Calcutta and Shantiniketan, has undertaken the study of India beyond the Ganges in Ptolemy's Geography. With geographical, historical and linguistic arguments, he has

been able to establish that "The Golden Chersonese" of Ptolemy is not as one commonly thought, the Malay Peninsula, but the Burmese deltas and also that the harbour of CATTIGARA is not to be searched for in TONQUIN but in Cochin-China, most probably in the vicinity of St. Jack's Cape. M. Marcel Destombes, the author of a "Catalogue of Dutch manuscript maps," which was published in 1941 in Saigon and in Hanoi in 1944, has brought out a work entitled "Petrus Plancius map of the world". Besides he went on editing his general catalogue on nautical manuscript maps, from the 13th century up to the 18th century and prepared a volume on the English maps of the East India company along with those of the privateers of America.

Mr. Ngmvēn Thiēn-Lāu, after a series of investigations on demography and "human geography" in Annam, has made several statements about it, in the "Indo-Chinese Institute for the study of man" at Hanoi which has its separate Bulletin. M. Paul Levy published in 1943 his "Prehistorical researches in the district of Mlu-Prei-Cambodia," in the 30th volume of the Ecole's Special Publications, along with archaeological comparisons and a Franco—Kuy vocabulary.

In 1940 he discovered an important layer of 2 Km long at Luang Prabang (Northern Laas) with abundant lithic material not yet met within Indo-China. It shows that prehistotical men here too lived along streams like those of France and Java. Here in Indo-China they lived along the big Mekong River, the ancient medium between the Asiatic continent and the Southern Archipelago. In 1942 M. Paul Levy also discovered near by Vientiane, 400 Km South Luang Prabang, similar palæolithes.

In 1940 Madeleni Colani has made researches on the Tran-Nuil plateau and found at an altitude of 1200 metres big monolithe jars and other tools.

Archaeology

It is in Cochin-China that the most remarkable discoveries were made in ancient maritime Cambodia. It adds a precious contribution to Founan's history in the early centuries of the Chirstian era. The most important discoveries were those made in OC-EO of which Mr. Paul Levy spoke about at the R.A. S.B. in 1945 and on which a paper has been read at the Historical Congress held last December (1946) in Patna.

In Cambodia M. Dupont excavated in 1944 the site of one of the pre-Angkorian capitals of Cambodia, at Angkor Barei, which may go back as far as the Founan period. Remarkable statues have been found during these excavations.

Mr. Coedes has continued the publication of his "Cambodian studies" in the 1940 Bulletin, of which the most important one deals with the funeral destination of the big Khmer monuments. In 1943 he also published at Hanoi a book to acquaint the public with the meaning of the Khmer ruins and what they represented in their time.

In 1944 M. Glaize, the curator of "Angkor Park", published a guide to the Angkor group of monuments with maps and illustrations.

Mr. Dupont has made a study of the mitred Viṣṇus in Indo-China in the Vol. XVI of the Bulletin, from the middle of the 8th and middle of the 9th century corresponding to the 7th century prototypes found in Pallava art.

Mr. Paris has written notes and articles in the 1941 Bulletin dealing with the ritual importance of the North-East (in Angkor monuments etc.).

In 1940 M. Dupont undertook excavations in Siam bringing to light interesting architectural specimens of Dvarati art. Besides in the tome XLII of the Bulletin he has studied a group of Buddhist images from central Malay Peninsula showing Singhalese influence which historical facts confirms. Victor Goloubew, in the 1938 Bulletin that came out in 1940, published a study on the "man with the Shawl of Mohenjadaro" contesting the opinion that this famous statue is closely connect-ed to Indian art and represents a meditating Yogin. He is of opinion that it belongs to outer Asia and may be dated 2,350-2,200 B.C. He also published studies about a metalic drum, and brought out a publicatian entitled "Monks and pilgrims in Asia."

Epigraphy

About thirty new inscriptions have been found during 1940-45 in Cambodia and Cochin-China; none are as important as the one found in the Prah Khan monument of Angkor Park which M.Coedes published in 1941. It gives an account of the foundation and the ceremonies which were celebrated in this funeral temple dedicated to the father of Jayavarman the VII (XIIth Century) and about the laying out of roads and building

of Dharmaśālās etc. The Sanskrit and Khmer inscriptions contained in the LXII tomes of the "Corpus of Cambodian Inscriptions" that Louis Finot published in 1926 have been transcribed and translated in 1942 by Mr. Coedes in the tome III/2 in the collection of Indo-Chinese texts and documents.

The Buddhist Institute of Cambodia has printed, "Modern inscriptions in Angkor Vat" edited by Mr. Coedes.

History

In 1944 Mr. Coedes published an "Ancient History of the Far Eastern Hinduised States." The first chapter gives a brief geographical outlook as well as a summary of the present knowledge about prehistory and ethnology in Greater India. The second chapter is devoted to the inventory of India's heritage to those countries and its civilizing virtue which they enjoyed for over a millenium. Mr. R. Stein has written a very important article on "Champa's antecedents". Mr. P. Dupont has published an article on the "Dislocation of the Tehen la" or the history of Cambodia during the 8th century A.D.

Prof. K.A.Nilakanta Sastri has given in the Bulletin of 1940 the results of two decade's researches on the Kingdom of Śrīvijaya.

Ethnology, Folklore, Religions

In the tome XXXVIII of the Bulletin, Madeleine Colani has made a comparative study on the articles used now in Indo-China with the European ones belonging to the Hallotatt and Tene periods and the Far Eastern and Indonesian ones.

In the 1942 Major Scidenpaden has published a comparative study about the ceremony of the opening of the first furrow in Indo-China, and an ancient clanish agriculture custom.

In the 1941 Bulletin M. Baradat has given a rich documentation concerning the "Tamre" ethnical groups of Cambodia, known in Siam under the name of "Chung".

The studies that Albert Sabalie had published on the "Rhade" of Darlac have been republished by M. Antomarchi with notes and translation; it is an important document for ethnologues and jurists on the customs of the "Rhade" revealed by that oral literature.

Mr. Ner has collected several texts on the customs of different groups (same Khmerized in the Darlac and High regions and two Muang epics). He has published in the tome

XL of the Bulletin a study on the Mois living near by the sea, in the tome XLI of the Bulletin a monography on the Mohamedans in Indo-China amounting to some 100·000 Chams and Malay people to be found in Cambodia aud Cochin-China.

Mr. P.Giulleminet made a study of the Bahnar's customs in the Kotum region.

Mr. Ngyen van Huyen has published in the tome XXXIX of the Bulletin a monograph about village festivals and in the tome V of the collection of Indo-Chinese texts and documents, a selection of the Marriage songs in the Langson and a Bang districts in Northern Jonkin. In 1944 he brought out a volume entitled the "Cult of the immortals in Annam" dealing mainly with annamite national saints, whose legend is part of the religious and spiritual annamite patrimony. Mr. Than van Giap has published in tome XXXIX of the Bulletin a rich documentation on the "Soul's Banner" particularly important in the Annamite buddhist funeral ritual.

The Buddhist pantheons in the principal Tonquinese pagodas have been carefully studied.

Mr. P. Levy has continued his enquiries on the annual festivals in Laos and has gathered new documents on Lastian magic and customs and the daily religious life. He has been able to trace the introduction of Buddhism in Laos prior to the 14th century.

The Buddhist Institute of Cambodia has continued to issue the volumes of the Tripitaka and published the 2nd Volume of the Cambodian official dictionary, the 4th volume of the Dhammapadha Atthakatha, the second one of the Visuddhimagga (Pali) and the first volume of a Cambodian translation of the "Fifty Jātakas" (also found in Burma), a Sanskrit grammar and the first volume on royal annual festivals. Besides, the Buddhist Institute is preparing an edition of the Vinaya's commentary and of a Pali-Cambodian dictionary.

Linguistic

Mr. R. Stein has published in the tome LXI of the Bulletin an interesting article on Tibetan etymology. All that concerns purely Sinologist and Annamite studies has been omitted in this account. But this summary gives all the same a fair idea of the activities of the E.F.E.O. Scholars interested in more details may write to the Secretariat of the E.F.E.O c/o Musee de Saigon, Cochin-China, Indo-China.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCHES IN COCHINCHINA (S.W. INDOCHINA) OR THE DISCOVERY OF FOUNAN'S SITES.

MME. KARPELEO.

The general public, even ten years ago, regarded as established the fact that no trace of any very ancient civilisation could be found in the Mekong and Bassac Delta, as the swampy soil of these regions are of recent formation.

The few remains of the Khmer occupation one knew of in Cochin-China, seemed to afford some justification to this belief. As a matter of fact no systematic investigations had ever been undertaken in that ancient Cambodian site, with the exception of those carried out in 1909, by Mr. Henri Parmentier. When in 1938, Monsieur Louis Malleret, member of the E.F.E.O., undertook a thorough archæological survey of this very part of Cochin-China, district by district, he was far from expecting that these researches would lead him to the discovery of Fou-Nan Kingdom which flourished earlier than the Southern Indo-Chinese Khmer Empire.

The first researches were most encouraging and full of promises as they brought to light many pieces of evidence regarding the great pre-Angkorean period. It did not seem, as it has done, that it would add several by-gone centuries to the history of these districts. Though the archæological researches in Cochin-China were greatly handicapped by the war, it was between 1942-1944 and that, in spite of innumerable difficulties, the most important discoveries were made.

Monsieur Malleret undertook the survey of the delta's lowest regions which revealed the existence of very ancient human settlements that had remained buried under 2 feet of alluvial deposits. Amongst the discovered settlement, the most important is the one known under the name of OC-EO. It is a big town which lies 25 miles from the coast of the gulf of Siam. Aerial observation has enabled Mr. Malleret to notice that the town was in shape a vast rectangle of about 3 by 1 and 1 by 2 kilometer, area of more than 400 hectares or 8 acres 4 roads 130 perches, that is to say half the area of Angkor Thom, the ancient Khmer capital.

Cutting across the town of OC-EO runs a canal leading to another site which seems to have been an ancient harbour; thus may one think that OC-EO must have been a maritime town directly connected with the sea through a previous port.

The excavation campaign Mr. Malleret undertook in 1944 which lasted three months, revealed the existence of two archæological levels corresponding to deposits of piles habitations, a few of the piles being still *in situ.* Foundations of brick buildings have also been found but on sandy browhills, two of which are of an architectural style not yet met with in Indo-China During these excavations many articles have been brought to light; stone polished axes, as well as pottery, of the crude variety and of a sober refined kind which in shape and decoration are closely related to the already known finds from the prehistorical Indo-Chinese sites, and to those discovered by I.H.N. Evans at Kuala at Silingsing in Malaya; more than 8,000 crystal, cornelian, onyx, amethyst and glass heads of different colouring. Some of them are the so-called " Roman beads ", others are gilded with a thin sheet of gold between two pieces of glass and are known as "gilding beads"; iron articles, lead amulets bearing Brahmanical symbols; silver "sun" coins of a most rare variety for Indo-China but common in Siam and Burma. The most striking discovery made is certainly that of several hundred articles of gold jewellery, rings, finger rings, seals, clasps, pendants, ear-drops, cases, ornaments of various kind, bead, necklaces, etc., with thin chasing or filigree work, showing almost delicate goldsmith's craftmanship. Hardly less important is a collection of about fifty cornelian crystal or symbols, some of which show Hellenistic affinities. One must also mention a big "cabochon", polished but uncut piece of glass paste bearing a profile with netted beard and hair, and having a bonnet of Scythic style as head-dress. It is possible for one to recognise in it a sussanide effigy without any difficulty. Articles of Roman origin were also found, and on a cornelian intaglic one may distinguish the bust and the profile of a face that leaves no doubt about its Roman origin. A golden medal bears the effigy of one of the Antonines with a very mutilated inscription where one may decipher all the same: AVREL...; another coin's inscription indicates clearly "Antoninus the Pius" with a date corresponding to 152 A.D.

The diversity of these discoveries proves the long occupation of the site representing most porbably several different periods. The Sanskrit inscription on the seals are in archaic type of script belonging to the first century of the Christian era according to M.G. Coedes, Director of the E.F.E.O.

As for the Sasanide "Cabuchon", it belongs most probably to the middle of the 4th century during which period, a sovereign of Iranian descent ruled over an ancient Hinduised state of Indo-China known as the " Founan ".

Up till now, the only sources of information regarding this ancient kingdom have been Chinese texts and a few Sanskrit inscriptions. These last Cochin-Chinese discoveries enable us, henceforth to place this very kingdom on the map with a fair amount of certainty and to acquire a much more precise idea about is material civilisation and art. They throw also an "unthought of" light on certain aspects of Indian colonisation in Indo-China, and it may be considered as one of the most important achievements of French archaeology during the past years. Doubtless the maritime town known to-day under the name of OC-EO was a big "emporium" where traders from far away places used to meet; only such a hypothesis could explain the Roman and Hellenistic articles found.

Aerial survey has also revealed ancient canal system and a land surface divided into small portions, where big estates now-a-days are to be found. So all this area opened to modern colonisation, less than 30 years ago, was once densely populated with small proprietors who, it appears, must have been skilful hydraulic engineers; fishery also must have been one of their means of livelihood as in their art, the maritime fauna occupies quite an important place.

Their town was also provided with many goldsmith's, lapidary's, and glass craftmen's workshops; much of the jewellery has most likely been manufactured on the spot and traces of metallurgical industry have also been found in several places during the excavation.

What has caused the ruin of such an important city, even the mere memory of which was utterly lost, is one of the most interesting problems that these discoveries put before us. The numerous golden jewellery that has been found in a scattered state allow us to think that a sudden cataclysm destroyed it

23

totaly but happily it has also preserved the town for being ransacked.

About a dozen of other sites, amongst which M. Malleret recognises at least a second town, were discovered in 1944 and nearly all are situated in the depressed regions of the Bassac's overflowing areas, innundated each year for a couple of weeks. It seems to indicate that important modifications have taken place during the past centuries concerning housing conditions in the low Delta and raise a geographical problem of acute interest.

One deeply regrets that the war and the sudden outbreak of the Japanese on the 9th March 1945 have paralysed and interrupted the pursuit of these researches which may be considered as a real disaster for two of the newly discovered Cochin-Chinese sites.

They have been unscrupoulusly plundered by local jewellery seekers. Twice, Malleret protested vehemently, but the Japanese authority took no steps whatever to put an end to such devastation which without exageration may be said to be a catastrophy for Science.

Monsieur Malleret's publication on his researches will appear—in French—in the B.E.F.E.O. under the title of "Transbassac archaeology" and will consists of the following fascicules each printed under separate cover:—

I Evolution of the Mekong Delta.
II Transbassac exploration (ground and aerial survey).
III OC-EO Excavations.
IV Lithic material.
V Bronze and iron metallurgy.
VI Lead metallurgy.
VII Jewellery.
VIII Jeweller's trade and glass-ware.
IX Glyptic.
X Pottery.
XI Statuary.
XII Tranbassac ancient civilisations.

The preliminary report of the 1944 Excavations will also appear in the B.E.F.E.O.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE *BRHADARANYAKA UPANISHAD*[1]

BY

DR. P. T. RAJU, M. A., PH. D., SASTRI,
Reader, Andhra University, Guntur.

One generally hesitates to speak of the psychology of the Upanishads, for what is called the psychology of the Upanishads is as much metaphysics and ethics as psychology. The difficulty is due to the central position of the *ātman* or Brahman, which is the ultimate reality of metaphysics and the subject-matter generally of phychology. The self or self-consciousness occupies the central position in many post-Kantian philosophers; but there it is not treated psychologically. For instance, its relation with the senses does not form an important topic in the discussion of their metaphysics, and the self and the mind are invariably identified. There is, among many western idealists, the tendency to subjective idealism but it ends merely in proving that the objective world is mind dependent; and the further question is not raised how the senses and the being of the world are to be derived from the mind. The discussions in the Upanishads on the point appear rather psychological than even epistemological; and though they may appear to be subjective idealist, it would be correct to call them *ātman*-idealist, for the subject itself of epistemology along with its object is to be derived from the *ātman*. From the *ātman* issue both the *bhoktā* (enjoyer or subject) and the *bhogya* (the enjoyed or object). On this point, there are some differences of view on details in Indian thought. By some the ego (*ahaṁkāra*) or the subject of experience is derived, not from the *ātman* directly, but from *buddhi* (will-intellect), which again is either directly or indirectly derived from the *ātman*; and from the ego are said to issue both the physical body with its senses, as the instrument of experience, and the objects experienced. But the atmosphere of this discussion is so loaded with the *ātman*-idea that these differences pale into insignificance, and the objective world appears as if it is part of

---

1. Paper read in the Psychology Section of the Indian Science Congress, January, 1946.

the subject-matter of the *ātman*-psychology. There is again a difficulty in interpreting the ego or the subject of experience, which will be noted later.

There are some who would prefer to call the psychology of the Upanishads, for its being akin to the psychology of the soul, by the name rational psychology. The authors of the Upanishads believed in the transmigration of the soul; and rational psychology is a very near appraoach to the Upanishadic psychology. But the chief interest of the Upanishadic discussions centres in the *ātman* and not in the soul. Much of contemporary psychology is psychology without mind. But almost the whole of earlier psychology is psychology with mind as its subject matter, and its chief interest is in mind, whether this mind be the soul which transmigrates or only the mind that perishes after death. Likewise, the interest of the Upanishadic psychology is in the *ātman*, and every attempt is made to present it in its most intimate connection with the subjective and objective aspects of experience. Just as contemporary psychology is largely developed with the view of applying it to the technique of perfecting our psychic nature, the *ātman* psychology was developed with the chief aim of applying it to the realisation of the *ātman*. The Upanishads, without the least doubt, believe that the *ātman* is the sole reality; but their aim is not merely a speculative establishment of its reality, but also telling man that it has to be realised or experienced, how it has experienced, and why it has to be experienced in that way. For instance, a prescription for developing memory has a psychological theory behind it. Similarly, a prescription for obtaining the experience of the *ātman* has a theory of the *ātman* as its basis. But as the *ātman* has to be realised inwardly, as it is the innermost reality of our selves, the discussion about the nature of the *ātman* is psychological as well as metaphysical. It is impossible, except only artificially, to separate psychology from metaphysics in these discussions.

There may be some who call this psychology transcendental psychology. So long as a name, due to its particular association in other fields, does not mislead the leader, it may be used. But the reader may be warned against some misunderstandings. The word transcendental is generally associated with Kant's philosophy, where it means an entity or principle postulated in order to explain ordinary experience. The transcendental may constitute our experience or be only a regulative principle. In

either case, the process by which it is connected with our experience is critically inferred, not directly experienced. But the process by which the *ātman* constitutes the world is not merely to be inferred but also to be experienced. It is as if an introspective account also of the entities critically established can be given.

But we have to beware of another mistake. This introspective account can be the introspective account, if it may be called by that name, only of the *ātman*, but not of the ego or the *ahaṁkāra*. The introspection of the ego cannot reveal the transcendental processes like the issuing of the subject and the object from the *ātman*. Hence the establishment of these proccesses through transcendental or critical logic is not psychology but logic. For one who has experienced those processes by experisencing the *ātman*, everything can become an object of introspection: and the authors of the Upanishads present everything as such, besides using logic also.

For the reasons, it is probably safer to use the word *ātman* psychology for the psychology of the Upanishads, not because the *atman* is the psyche, but because the *ātman* is to be discovered and experienced through psychic processes. The word *ātman* is known to all the philosophers of the world; and we would be preserving the individuality of the Upanishadic tradition by lessening the scope for reading foreign ideas into it. One may still question whether all that is so included is psychology; and the question may be asked whether it is metaphysics even. The only reply possible is that the *ātman* psychology or the *ātman* metaphysics has its own peculiarity, and that its theories may be understood without attaching too great importance to some nomenclature.

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad* is the biggest of all the Upanishads, and contains a variety of subjects and almost all the important ideas of the other Upanishads. It is said that the *Māṇḍūkya Upanishad*, which discusses the three states of the self, the waking state, the dream and the deep sleep, gives the essence of the teaching of the Upanishads. But this idea also is contained in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*. The subject matter of all the Upanishads may be divided into two parts or aspects, the *upāsana* aspect, which prescribes the forms of medication, and the theoretical aspect, which forms the theoretical basis for that prescription. For our present purpose, the theoretical is the more important.

Of all the theoretical discussions, again, the most important is the dialogue betweed king Janaka and Yajnavalkya.[1] Janaka begins with the simple question: In what light does man see the objects? Yajnavalkya replies: In the light of the sun. The discussion continues.

Janaka: In what light does man see the objects, when the sun sets?

Yajnavalkya: In the light of the moon.

Janaka: When both the sun and the moon set, in what light does man see the objects?

Yajnavalkya: Then fire is his light.

Janaka: When the sun and the moon set and when there is no fire, in what light does man see the objects?

Yajnavalkya: Then speech in his light, for then it is only with the help of speech that men locate the objects and act.

Janaka: When the sun and the moon set and fire and speech subside, in what light does man see the objects?

This is an important question, and Yajnavalkya gives a long answer. The situation described by Janaka is the situation of the dream. What is the light in which we see the object in dream? Yajnavalkya says, it is the light of the *ātman*. In dream, man creates his own objects and sees them in the light of his own self or *ātman*. The implication is that, if we are to experience the *ātman*, we have to experience that light. It is not enough to know that, as in that light we see the dream objects, we experience the light along with the objects. For what the Upanishads require of man is to experience that light as such, try to make that directly the object of cognition; but has that light is in essence the *ātman* itself, the Upanishads believe that, in that process, the distinction between subject and object will be transcended and the subject realises its identity with the *ātman*. But this is not an easy process; and the whole of the yogic discipline is meant for it.

Man wanders between the two states of dream and waking consciousness like a fish between the two banks of a river. He gets tired and falls into deep sleep, where his mind is completely at rest. There he sees nothing and does nothing. This is man's third state. In it the distinction between subject and object, *bhoktā* and *bhogya*, is lost. In it there is no second.

1. IV, 3, 1. following.

Generally after deep sleep, man enters again one of the other two states. But one who is able to catch the light of the *ātman* and thereby realise his oneness with it, achieves the fourth state, which is beyond deep sleep and which is the *ātman* in its purity and which is existence, consciousness and bliss (*saccidānanda*). This state is a matter for experience: it is an experience to be realised, not merely to be postulated.

This discussion, as pointed out in the introduction, is both psychological and metaphysical. Further, this realisation is the highest aim of Hindu religion. Almost all great religions teach us that the highest reality or God is again our innermost reality. Generally the teaching has to be accepted on trust or faith. But the Upanishadic seers took this innermost reality more as a matter of fact than as a matter of faith. We may conveniently call it a psychological fact. They were peculiarly impressed by man's passing through the three states regularly, and were led to believe that the truth or essence of man must be found within the three states and so beyond each. It is very difficult to draw the distinction between the natural and the supernatural here. If the three states belong to the natural, the fourth or the highest state is not only a continuation of the three but also pervades each. It is what supplies the light of the dream; it is that consciousness with which man feels that he is in a sort of the grip of blissfulness and is totally ignorant of all objects in deep sleep, for even the knowledge of bliss and ignorance requires consciousness; and without that light, and in spite of the light of the sun, the moon, etc., man cannot know anything even in the waking state.

Further, this is a peculiar religious psychology, the like of which we hardly come across anywhere else and which is more often misunderstood than appreciated rightly. Religious psychology of the west is almost invariably occupied with religious sentiments, belief, faith, problems of immortality, conversion, the psychological aspects of worship and prayer, descriptions of God-consciousness, and mystical experiences, in which the individual soul is merged in the infinite mind. But by few is the question raised: If God or the Absolute is our innermost reality then what is that 'inwardising' process by which that reality can be realised? There is even a metaphysical question: If ultimate reality is our innermost reality, and if the world of perception issues out of that reality, are we to think of it as

the sum total of reality that surrounds us or as the centre of our conscious being?

There is another question, which is both psychological and epistemological for the Upanishadic seers. It is said that man passes through the states of wakefulness, dream and deep sleep and can enter the fourth state also. But who is it exactly that passes through these states? Man with his body as the subject of waking consciousness is not the subject of dream consciousness. Neither the sense organs nor the organs of action that belong to the physical body are active in dream. The body that enjoys the dream experiences is not the same as the body that enjoys the experiences of waking state. When we wake up after dream, we shake off its experiences and feel that we are really untouched by them. True, we say: "I saw that, I did that in the dream", and there is thus the identification of the 'I' of the waking consciousness with the 'I' of the dream. But there is also the repudiation by the former of the experiences of the latter, which is a disowning. Further, the latter also may either indirectly or directly disown the experiences of the former. A weak man may dream that he is a sturdy warrior, and a hungry man that his stomach is full. Though the physical body is completely at rest the dreamer dreams himself going about, seeing and acting. Thus in the dream, a new body as an instrument of action is created; there is now a new division into subject and object; there is a new *bhoktā* and new *bhogya*.

Most of the objeets we dream are experiences of the waking consciousness, or experiences built upon, or developed out of those experiences. Consequently, it may be said that the dream subject is the same as the waking subject. True, most of the dream experiences are due to the impressions left by the waking experiences. The Upanishads have no wish to refute this truth. But they clinch the fact that the waking 'I' disowns that it really enjoyed the dream experiences; it takes no moral responsibility for what happens in dreams. It is the dream 'I' that really experiences them; the waking 'I' can only be a bare witness. The Upanishads are interested in stressing the fact that the division into subject and object in dreams is different from the division into subject and object in the waking state.

It has to be pointed out in this connection that mind, subject and ego have different connotations in European and Indian thought. Mind means all these in European thought. Particuarly in contemporary psychology and phiolsophy[1], mind is not considered without the physical body. Similarly, the subject of experience has no meaning without the body. But in Indian thought, almost from the very beginnings, these mean different things. Ego is really the *ahaṁkāra* or the 'I'. According to the Sankhya, for instance, the mind occupies a lower position than the ego and is a derivate from it. In the *Bṛahadāraṇyaka*, the nature and position of *ahaṁkāra* is not explicitly discussed; but it is probably identical with the *manas*[2] which is generally translated by the word mind, or with the *purusha* or *atman* become finite. The subject of action and cognition in all the states is called the *purusha* or person. He is regarded as identifying himself with the different bodies of the three states, with the physical body in the waking state, with the spurious body of the dream, and with the *kāraṇaśarīra* or causal body of deep sleep. The peculiarity of the last is that in it the distinction between bodies which are objects and the body which is the subject is lost, and everything is said to exist in it in a latent or germinal form. In the other two states, the *purusha* is said to identify himself with the subject bodies. Therefore, if we are to take the body also as part of the subject, the dream and the waking subjects will have to be treated as different. If, on the other hand, we take the subject of experience as distinct from the body with which it identifies itself and which still it makes an object of cognition, then the subject of the two states may be treated as the same, but the bodies which are the instruments of its action and cognition as different. And if the subject is the same as the ego or *ahaṁkāra*, we have to regard the latter also similarly. Thus the ego identifying itself with the physical body repudiates the experiences of itself as identifying itself with the dream body.

When we read the evolution of the world from the innermost reality, we feel that it is the description of some mystical

---

1. Whitehead: *Science and the Modern World* (1926), p. 128.

2. The functions of the mind are described differently in different places of the same Upanishad. I, 5, 3, gives them as desire, deliberation, doubt, faith, want of faith, patience, impatience, shame, intelligence and fear.

experience, for which there can be no rationale. For instance the Sankhyan account of the evolution of the world from the combination of Purusha and Prakṛti is treated as mythical, or mystical, and is generally looked down upon as unscientific. The Sankhya asserts that from Prakrti is evolved the *buddhi* (will+intellect), from the *buddhi* the *ahaṁkāra* (ego), from the *ahaṁkāra* the *manas* (mind) and the five *tanmātras* (subtle elements), from the *manas* the five sense organs and the five organs of action (hands, feet, penis, anus, and the organ of speech), and from the five subtle elements the five gross elements. Obviously, this is not the evolution of the world as science teaches us. But from the standpoint of the *ātman*-psychology and metaphysics, such must be the evolution of the world. If everything is to evolve from the innermost reality, and if that reality is the *ātman*, then everything is to be derived or has to evolve out of the *ātman*. How can we understand this process?

If we are to depend entirely upon the world of waking consciousness for understanding the process of the evolution of the world from the innermost reality, we are helpless. All that can be said, following Berkeley, is that the objects are mind-dependent. Probably Berkeley, as a religious man, was guided in his writings by the motive of proving that everything was to be derived from the innermost reality. But this motive did not work openly and systematically, and he was dismissed by many as a subjective idealist. The Upanishadic seers made no secret of their intention, and they followed a special method. They saw that man was able to create a body with the organs of action and of cognition along with their corresponding objects in dream. He identifies himself with the body of the dream and becomes the agent and enjoyer. From his own ego or *ahaṁkāra*—if we distinguish the *ahaṁkāra* from the body—the dream mind that feels pain and pleasure, the body with its organs, and the objects are evolved. The ego that passes from the waking state to the dream withdraws the functions of the sense organs into itself—so the Upanishad says[1]—in the transition, and throws them out again when it creates the dream-body and the objects. Here the senses and their objects are evolutes out of the *ahaṁkāra*. The Sankhya introduces the *manas* (mind) in between the *ahaṁkāra* and the senses, as common unity of the last and also for sensing pain and pleasure.

---

1. II, 1, 18.

Similarly, is the world of the waking consciousness evolved? Both the subject, which is the body, and the objects are evolutes[1] out of the ego. Just as the body is my body, the objects I cognise are my objects. The experience of which the subject and object are two poles is my experience or some person's experience. Such an experience, with its two poles, according to the Upanishads, is an evolute ultimately from the self or *ātman*. The Upanishads are aware of the stability and instability respectively of the waking and dream experiences, but this difference does not alter the mode of evolution. There are some differences of view on this throwing out and withdrawing of the senses and their objects in Indian thought. Yet the general nature of the process is the same for all. And if at all the religious truth that ultimate reality is the same as our innermost reality is true, then the rationale of the truth can be found in the Upanishads only.

The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* account of this process of evolution and withdrawal is somewhat different from that of the Sankhya. Of the functions of the waking state, *prāṇa* [2] or vital force is regarded as higher than mind and the senses. But in the passage from wakefulness to dream, the body is said to be left in charge[3] of the vital force; the mind and other functions are withdrawn and used in dream. Higher than mind is *vijñāna*, which works in both these states. During deep sleep also, the body is left in charge of the vital force; but mind and the other senses are withdrawn into *vijñāna* and *vijñāna* itself, in a germinal state, enters ignorance, which is, for the Upanishads, a positive entity, psychical and metaphysical. This ignorance of deep sleep is the cause of the world of subject and object. The light of consciousness that is hidden by this ignorance and lights up the dream world, and without which the world of waking consciousness

---

1. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* says that a hundred or even a thousand senses with corresponding objects may be evolved. II, 5, 19. But our knowledge is limited to a few only.

2. I, 5, 3. *Prāṇa* is of six kinds. *Prāṇa* is the nerve function proceeding from the heart upwards. *Apāna* proceeds from the heart downwards. *Vyāna* is the connection between the two. *Udāna* causes nutrition, etc., and extends from the feet upwards. *Samāna* in the belly helps assimilation of food and drink. *Ana* connects all.

3. II, 3, 12.

cannot be really experienced, is the *ātman*. Without it the world of forms cannot produce in us the experience that it exists.

Here there are some physiological considerations. The person of the waking state, taking mind and the senses with him, moves about in the body of the waking state in dream.[1] And both in dream and deep sleep, he enters certain nerves called *hitas*, which extend from the heart to the pericardium.[2]

There is another consideration which belongs to para-psychology, particularly to the psychology of transmigration. It is said that the state between one life and another, between life in this world and life in the other, is that of the dream.[3] That is, the dream state intervenes not only between the waking state and deep sleep but also between two lives. When the physical body is left back at death, mind, etc., are withdrawn into *vijñāna*, which leaves the body and creates a dream-world till a new body is found. In that dream state, the person or *purusha* is able to percieve both the past life and the future. The rationale of this statement can be understood easily only after psychic research is sufficiently advanced.

To sum up. In the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, there are four points of psychological interest. The first and the most important is the *ātman* psychology with its three states. It is also religious psychology as well as metaphysics. The second is the importance given to the *prāṇa* or vital force. Its presence makes the body living and absence dead. It is to take charge of the physical body when mind and the senses leave it in dream and deep sleep. The third is the consideration about the nerves called the *hitas*, which consciousness enters in dream and deep sleep. The fourth is the psychology of transmigration.

1. II, 1. 18.
2. IV, 3, 20 & II, 1, 19.
3. IV, 3, 9.

"THE VITALITY AND PERSISTENCE OF SANSKRIT."

BY

SRI K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR, B.A., B.L.

In his widely read and fascinating book 'The Discovery of India', Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, one of the noblest personalities of this age, devotes a few pages to the exposition of what he calls "The Vitality and Persistence of Sanskrit". (*See* pages 182-188). We find therein many true and significant observations worthy of the serious attention of all Indians, specially those politicians who are entrusted with the task of guiding the educational policy of our country. "Sanskrit," he says, "is a language amazingly rich, efflorescent, full of luxuriant growth of all kinds, and yet precise and strictly keeping within the frame-work of grammar which Panini laid down two thousand six hundred years ago. It spread out, added to its richness, became fuller and more ornate, but always it stuck to its original roots."

Commenting on the structure of the language he quotes a weighty observation made by the great oriental scholar, Sir William Jones, as long ago as 1784: "The Sans krit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin and more exquisitely refined than either". Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru further observes that Sir William Jones was followed by many other European scholars, English, French, German and others who studied Sanskrit and laid the foundations of a new science, comparative philology. He truly remarks that "Sanskrit, like other classical languages, is full of words which have not only poetic beauty but a deep significance, a host of associated ideas, which cannot be translated into a language foreign in spirit and outlook. Even its grammar, its philosophy have a strong poetic content; one of its old dictionaries is in poetic form. Our modern languages in India are children of Sanskrit and to it owe most of their vocabulary and their forms of expression. Many rich and significant words in Sanskrit poetry and philosophy, untranslatable in foreign languages, are still living parts of our popular languages". This is indeed quite true and rests upon the solid foundation of easily ascertainable facts. To give one example, the two Sanskrit words 'Tattva' and 'Bhāva'

are so rich and significant that they are used invariably in Tamil. They have come to form part of the structure of the Tamil language itself, so that many people regard them as Tamil words. He says "Sanskrit itself, though long dead as a language of the people, has still an astonishing vitality". He regrets that there is hardly any translation in English or any other foreign language from the Sanskrit which can be called worthy or just to the original. Both Indians and foreigners have failed in this work for different reasons. That is a great pity and the world misses something that is full of beauty and imagination and deep thinking, something that is not merely the heritage of India but should be the heritage of the human race." He refers to the illustrious example of the English people. He says "The hard discipline, reverent approach and insight of the English translators of the Authorized Version of the Bible, not only produced a noble book, but gave to the English language strength and dignity. Generations of European scholars and poets have laboured lovingly over Greek and Latin classics and produced fine translations in various European languages. Unfortunately this work has yet to be done with the Sanskrit classics."

Writing about the application of the expression 'Dead Language' to Greek and Latin, Mr. D'Arcy W. Thompson in his book 'Day dreams of a School-Master' says as follows: "I can understand what is meant by a 'Dead Sea' and should suppose it to be a sheet of water cut off from all intercourse with the main ocean; never rising with its flow; never sinking with its ebb; never skimmed by the sail of commerce; never flapped by the wing of wandering bird; undisturbed by the bustle of the restless world; but slumbering in a desolate wilderness". "But can such a term be applied to that Hellenic speech that in the Iliad has rolled, like the great Father of Waters, its course unhindered down three-thousand years; that in Pindar still soars heavenwards, staring at the sun; that rises and falls in Plato with the long, sequacious music of Æolian lute; that moves stately and black-stoled in Æschylus; that pierces with a trumpet-sound in Demosthenes? If it be dead, then what language is alive?" Much in the same manner and style, I ask, can such a term be applied to that Sanskrit speech that in the Ramayana has rolled its course unhindered down 5000 years and is still sung and expounded in street corners

and platforms to admiring and devoted audiences in every hamlet in India; that in the Upanishad still soars heavenwards, staring at the sun and becomes at once the solace of one's life and the solace of one's death; that rises and falls in the Veda in one long and sequacious music, when solemnly intoned on all happy and auspicious occasions in every Hindu home and festival; that pierces with a trumpet-sound in the Bhagavad Gita; that moves with dulcet symphony in Kalidasa and that attains majesty and all-comprehensive sweep in the Mahabharata? If Sanskrit be dead, then what language is alive? Dr. F. W. Thomas speaking at the Oriental Conference held in 1937 at Trivandrum pointed out what a great unifying force Sanskrit had been in India and how widespread its use still was. He actually suggested that a simple form of Sanskrit, a kind of basic Sanskrit should be encouraged as a common All-India language today. Speaking many years before this Dr. Otto Schrader of the Adyar Library in an address delivered by him in 1905 at the Ranade Hall, Mylapore, suggested the form of an easy simple Sanskrit composed of words in current use in the languages of the people in India as the basic Sanskrit which can be adopted as common All-India language. Pandit Nehru says "it is interesting to note that in modern Thailand when the need arose for new technical, scientific and Governmental terms, many of these were adapted from Sanskrit". Even the languages of Southern India had always in the past adopted a brotherly attitude and absorbed many words, phrases and forms of expression from Sanskrit. This is only natural as the same common culture finds expression in them. In fact one is struck by the beautiful way in which fine, vibrant and sweet Sanskrit phrases are blended harmoniously into the exquisite poetry and heavenly music of the Tevaram Hymns of the Tamil Saint, Appar Swamigal. *Vide* two Hymns in praise of the Lord of Tiruvizhimizhalai and Tiruvarur in the Tamil country.

1. தாயானைச் சக்கரமாற் கீந்தான் றன்னைச்
சங்கரனைச் சந்தோக சாமமோதும்
வாயானை மந்திரிப்பார் மனத்துளானை
வஞ்சனை யாலஞ் செழுத்தும் வழுத்துவார்க்குச்
சேயானைத் திருவீழி மிழலையானைச்
சேராதார் தீநெறிக்கே சேர்கின் றாரே.

Note the phrase छन्दोगसाम

2. சங்கரன்காண் சக்கரமாற் கருள் செய்தான் காண்
    தருணேந்து சேகரன் காண்டலைவன் றான்கா
ணங்கமலத்தயன் சிரங்களைந்தி லொன்றை
    யறுத்தவன் காணணிபொழில் சூழையாற்றான்கா
ணெங்கள் பெருமான் காணென்னிடர்கள் போக
    வருள்செய்யு மிறைவன் காணிமை யோரேத்துஞ்
செங்கமல வயல்புடை சூழ்திருவாரூரிற்
    திரு மூலட்டானத்தெஞ் செல்வன்றானே.

Note the word तरुणेन्दुशेखर

BOOK REVIEWS.

Bhoja's Srngara Prakasa.—A Thesis by Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph.D., Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras. Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay. Parts 1 and 2, Rs. 15-0-0.

It is an important fact to be noted by all lovers of literature, especially by those unacquainted with Sanskrit literature, that there is a well-developed system of poetics and literary criticism in Sanskrit, called by the general name Alamkara Sastra, which will repay a careful study by all students of literature, to whatever language the particular literature they study may belong. The history of Sanskrit literary criticism dates from remote antiquity. There has been an illustrious galaxy of authors beginning from Sage Bharata, such as Bhamaha, Dandin, Vamana, Kuntaka, Anandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Kshemendra, Dhananjaya, Rajasekhara, Mammata and Appayya Dikshita. Among them, Bhoja occupies a very prominent place. He is known as the author of two important works on literary criticism, one namely the Sarasvati Kanthabharana and the other the Srngara Prakasa. The Sarasvati Kanthabharana is a smaller treatise, while the Srngara Prakasa is a very comprehensive work which endeavours to bring under literature and literary appreciation, everything of importance in Indian thought. King Bhoja of Dhara is reputed, according to well-known literary tradition, as a great scholar and patron of many poets. It is indeed very highly probable that he should have been the author of these two works, though doubts have been thrown on it by some scholars. The editors of the New Indian Antiquary propose to publish Dr. Raghavan's thesis on this work of Bhoja in four parts. Two parts have already come out in print, the second of which we have received recently. The Srngara Prakasa itself consists of thirty six chapters and has not yet been published in full. But the thesis of Dr. V. Raghavan will effectively enable us to have a correct and comprehensive idea of the contents of the Srngara Prakasa, its place in the history of Sanskrit Literary criticism, its contribution to Indian thought on the various aspects of literary criticism, such as Gunas, Doshas, Alamkara, Rasa,

Dhvani, etc., the details of the topics dealt with by it and also the relation of its thought to the development of literary criticism both before and after it. I am sure that the two volumes of the thesis will themselves constitute an important work on literary criticism in Sanskrit. Dr. V. Raghavan, though young in years, has attained a great mastery of this branch of Sanskrit learning. He has already contributed many articles which have been published later in book form such as "The Number of Rasas", "Some Concepts of the Alamkara Sastra" etc. He is one of the Lecturers in the University of Madras and as one responsible for the Catalogus Catalogorum, he has acquired an intimate acquaintance with the voluminous manuscript literature in Sanskrit. He is eminently qualified to bring to bear the search-light of his vast knowledge and deep erudition on such a massive work like the Srngara Prakasa.

The name, Srngara Prakasa, given to the work requires explanation. The first impression of the reader will be that it refers to the well-known Srngara Rasa of the Alamkara Sastra. But Bhoja has not used it in that sense. In his work he has developed a new theory of Rasa. The distinctive features of Rasa are, according to him, connoted by the epithets Abhimana-Ahamkara and Srngara. The epithet Srngara is used by him in the sense of signifying 'the peak of cultural perfection' attained by the soul of man when it is imbued with Rasa. Another remarkable feature of Rasa is that it is capable of transforming into pleasure even painful things. In poetry and drama tragedy becomes a source of poetic and literary enjoyment and a spectator of death and misery enacted on the stage moved to pity in sympathetic response derives, in strange contrast, the unique pleasure of aesthetic enjoyment. This Bhoja considers a peculiar characteristic of Rasa and he connotes it by the word 'Abhimana'. Another characteristic of Rasa according to him is the development of self-consciousness in the Rasika. All literary enjoyment is according to him subjective. Kalidasa has finely expressed the same idea in the phrase "तन्मयत्वं रसेषु". The whole theory has emanated from the characteristic tendency of the Hindu mind for analysis and synthesis at the same time. As Dr. Raghavan explains on page 420 of the Second Part, Bhoja has one fundamental Rasa, then a number of bhavas all capable of becoming Rasas themselves, though the name Rasa applies to them only through Upacara, and lastly

they all become again the one Rasa of Preman. Similar theories have been suggested by others. The great Poet Bavabhuti refers to the theory that the Karuna Rasa is the one and only Rasa and the the other Rasas are only Vivartas of it, *i.e.*, apparent but not real modifications of it. Hence, according to Bhoja, Rasa can be aptly described by the three epithets Abhimana-Ahamkara-Srngara. Srngara being the most important of them all, he has given the name Srngara Prakasa to the work so that the name itself might suggest his original contribution to the theory of Rasa.

Dr. Raghavan's thesis must be accepted on all hands as a great contribution to the thought on Sanskrit literary criticism and the late Mahamahopadhyaya Professor Kuppuswami Sastri's opinion expressed in his Foreword "that when the whole treatise is published the world of scholars will see how King Bhoja's mind was moving about a thousand years ago in the sphere of literary criticism in Sanskrit and what a well-informed Sanskrit scholar of conspicuous ability—Dr. Raghavan—has done in the same sphere in modern times" is thoroughly justified.

K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR.

The Religious Basis of the Forms of Indian Society. Indian Culture and English Influence. East and West. By Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Orientalia, 47 West 47th Street, New York. 1946.

Dr. Coomaraswamy to whom the world owes so much for its understanding of Indian art, has, for some years now, been one to whom, to quote his own words in the first of the lectures mentioned above, "no day passes in which he does not search the Scriptures, and the works of the great theologians of all ages, so far as they are accessible to him in modern languages and in Latin, Greek, or Sanskrit," and one to whom the interpretation to the West of the fundamental principles of Hindu view of life, social organisation and philosophical ideals has become a mission.

The first of the three lectures published in this booklet is an address delivered by him at Ann Arbor to the Students' Religious Association; and the second is an address to Indian Students and their friends at the Massachussets Institute of Technology. The central aim of all the three lectures is to

explain the value of the Oriental pattern of Traditional life based on Dharma as against the worthless, competitive, commercial, economic, class ridden social fabric of the West. The significance of Puruṣārtha, Varṇa, Āśrama, Dharma, vocation, craft, etc. are all effectively explained, with appropriate quotations of parallel ideas from eminent ancient and medieval writers of the West, as also some of the recent writers of the West on Indian culture like Rene Guenon, who, as a contrast to the philological orientalists, have established "a real and vital contact with Indian metaphysics, which become for them a transforming experience." To those of us especially who, under the influence of the western institutions, are unable to understand the high value of our own ancient scheme, these lectures, which point out the danger of a modern Indian falling between two stools, will be most valuable. The West is called upon to listen to the message of the East, not the East of Nehru even, but of Gandhi. Learned, illuminating and at the same time of wide range, touching several aspects of modern Indian life and even minute details of polity like the anti-Brahman employment G. O., these lectures call upon us to save and maintain our own "evaluated and significant" way of living, not get disorganised and go down before the tempest of the 'equalitarian' preachings of modern West, and free ourselves from "the British Government, the 'hold-fast' (Namuci) of the present age," and that Empire which "is a commercial financial institution having theft as its final object."

Besides their value to scholars, these lectures on the real significance of Hindu social make-up and its idealogy are exerting a great deal of good influence in America to which quislings were being flown by our imperialist 'Namucis' to discredit us. In the valuable notes and bibliography appended to the first lecture, attention may specially be drawn to the book "Alternative to Death" by the Earl of Portsmouth, 1944.

V. R.

Candralekhā Saṭṭaka of Rudradāsa. Edited by Dr. A. N. Upadhye, M. A., D. Litt., Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. Rs. 6-0-0.

Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Kolhapur, has already establised himself as an assiduous, thorough-going and scholarly editor in the field of Jain and Prākṛt studies. The present publication issued through the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan of Sjt. K. M.

Munshi, Bombay, belongs to the latter field in which Dr. Upadhye has already given us Kamsavaho, Usāniruddha etc. The work belongs, like the Kamsavaho and the Usāniruddha, to Kerala in South India and to an age when Prākṛt was cultivated by some as a mere literary exercise. The edition is based on three manuscripts and is furnished with full critical apparatus in the form of Introduction, Notes, Indices, etc. In his learned and lengthy Introduction, the editor discusses the Mss. material, the contents of the play which deals with the marriage of Mānaveda, Zamorin of Calicut, with princess Candralekhā, Indian Drama in general and the Saṭṭaka class in particular to which the present work belongs, the Saṭṭakas known so far, the Prākṛt of the work, and the author Rudradāsa of Calicut in Kerala who probably wrote about the middle of the 17th century. His remark in the Introduction (p. 27) that the popular origin of the Vidūṣaka is strengthened by the Prākṛt basis of his name which is suggested to be a hyper-Sanskritised back-formation from *viuso* or *viusao* (with *k*-suffix) to be connected to *Vidvas* is a speculation requiring further evidence in its support.

V. R.

Prākṛt Languages and Their contribution to Indian Culture. By Dr. S. M. Katre, M.A., Ph.D. Bharatiya Vidya studies 3. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. Rs. 2-8-0.

Dr. S. M. Katre, Director of the Deccan College Post Graduate Research Institute, occupies a leading place today among the linguists in the field of Indian Indologists. Sjt. Munshi is to be congratulated on securing his servies for presenting to the scholars, students and the general cultured public a monograph in the Series of popular studies of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan on the important subject of Prākṛt Languages and Literature. The aim of the Publisher and the ability and success of the author have been well realised in this compact book of about a hundred pages, dealing with Middle Indo-Aryan language and literature, linguistic features of Middle Indo-Aryan, contribution of Middle Indo-Aryan to old Indo-Aryan and New Indo-Aryan and Middle Indo-Aryan literature on Arts and Sciences. The book is an Introduction giving a panoramic view, adopting an original approach from the point of view of culture and contribution.

V. R.

Vedavāda dvātriṃśikā by Siddhasena Divākara. Bhāratīya Vidyā Granthāvalī, 7, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay 0-12-0.

There is a class of writings of old Jain authors like Yogīndu and Kundakunda which take the form of mystic literature, the characterisation of the Supreme Divinity and its seeker in these works being of a non-sectarian character and exhibiting vocabulary and ideas that are common to the Upaniṣads, Gītā etc. To this class belongs the present work of the well known Jain author Siddhasena Divākara. In thirty-two verses cast in vedic metrical forms, Siddhasena Divākara describes here the ultimate reality and its realisation, almost in the words, phrases and even lines of the Upaniṣads, notably the Śvetāśvatara. Pandit Sri Sukhalalji Sanghavi has explained the verses fully in a Hindi gloss and Introduction.

V. R.

Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra Sūri. Singhi Jain Series 19. Edited by Sri Jinavijayamuni. With a Critical Introduction by Dr. A. N. Upadhye. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, Rs. 5-8-0.

The ex-Brahman Haribhdra Sūri was a prolific Śvetāmbara Jain writer of the 8th century A. D. One of his works is the Dhūrtākhyāna in Apabhraṃśa Prākṛt intended to bring into ridicule Brahmanic Purāṇas and Itihāsas. The work is ably edited by the Jain scholar Muni Jinavijayaji. Dr. A. N. Upadhye's lengthy introduction discusses, among many other subjects, the value of the work as satire. The Prākṛt text is followed by the Sanskrit version of Sanghatilakācārya, and the Gujarathi version of an unknown author.

V. R.

Srimad Bhagavad Gītā Laghukośa: A Concise Dictionary of the Bhagavad Gītā. Compiled by Sri Lakshmana Raghunath Gokhale, Vakil, 419, Narayan Peth, Poona. Rs. 10.

This is a very valuable publication. Sri Lakshman Raghunath Gokhale, a keen student of the Gītā, has given us here first the text of the Gītā; immediately beneath the respective series of verses, the *Padaccheda* of the verses is given; and this is followed by an Alphabetical Dictionary of the words in the Gītā, each word being treated at some length from the point of view of its grammar, meaning and philosophical

significance. The medium of explanation adopted is Marathī. We congratulate Sri Lakshman Raghunath Gokhale on this work of his, and wish him success in the other items of Gītā-work he has thought of.

V. R.

Hinduism outside India : By Swami Jagadiswarananda. Sri Ramakrishna Ashram, Rajkot, Kathiawar. Rs. 2-8-0.

It is wellknown to scholars that the great Hindu civilization had a successful colonial history in countries outside India, especially in the Far East regions. But this glorious chapter of Indian History is not adequately known to the general public. It is but fitting that a votary of the Ramakrishna Mission, to whom has fallen the task of carrying the message of Hinduism to the distant countries of the modern world, should have brought in the form of a popular book accounts of the part played by Hinduism in Ceylon, Burma, Siam, Combodia, Indo-China, Phillipines, Bali, Java, Malaya and the Americas. Besides his own articles, Swami Jagadisvarananda has included here some articles of Dr. D. N. Roy, Dr. S. K. Chatterjee and Swami Gambhirananda. The book is bound to be useful in enlightening the general readers who are not familiar in the specialised works of research in this field.

V. R.

Studies in the Ramayana. By Sahitivallabha Sarasvata Sarajna T. Sundaracharyar of Shiyali B.A., B.L. Gopathi Narayanaswami Chetti Road, T. Nagar, Madras. Rs. 2.

Sri T. Sundarachariar is a highly gifted exponent of Sanskrit classics. Few will be the literary audiences in South India interested in Sanskrit that have not heard him or admired his marvellous memory, literary approach and keen wit. It is a happy circumstance that one who had all the time adopted mostly the medium of lecture has come forward to give his ideas in the enduring form of a book. This is the first of his series of studies on the Rāmāyaṇa, covering the Bālakāṇḍa; written in excellent prose, the exposition is followed by appendices and notes giving a number of valuable ideas and references. We hope that Sri Sundarachariar will soon complete the exposition of the Rāmāyaṇa, and give us also in book-form his wellknown expositions of the themes of the Mahābhārata, the Bhāgavata etc.

V. R.

Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram, with an English Commentary. By Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., PH.D. Annamalai University Tamil Series 9. Rs. 5.

Historical Tamil Reader. By Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, Annamalai University. Rs. 2-8-0.

Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, who combines equipment in both Sanskrit and Tamil, is familiar to the readers of the Journal of Oriental Research, through which were published two parts of his English annotated editions of the Tolkāppiyam and his History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil. The Annamalai University authorities are to be congratulated for giving a fillip to his work on Tamil Grammar and Literature. In the first mentioned book, Dr. Sastri gives us the text of the 460 sūtras of the nine chapters of the Collatikāram or the section dealing with Syntax and Morphology in the oldest extant Tamil Grammar, Tolkāppiyam, with Roman transliteration, and English Translation and Notes which include illustrations. In a detailed preface, he draws attention first to such of the sūtras in the whole text of Tolkāppiyam as are valuable for a historical student of Tamil Grammar, and show evidences of Sanskrit influence; discusses then the date of the Tolkāppiyanār which according to him is not later than 2nd Cent. B. C., and lastly describes the commentators on the text. As the Editor has pointed out in his preface, such a translated and English annotated edition will greatly benefit students of language outside Tamilnad.

It is on the suggestion of one such linguist outside Tamilnad, Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji of Calcutta, that Dr. Sastri compiled his short Historical Tamil Reader, giving selections of Tamil from Tolkāppiyam down to the present day, each selection carrying the text in Tamil and Roman scripts, prose order, English Translation, and explanatory notes, both linguistic and literary. These selections are preceded by an introduction which deals with the growth and nature of Tamil language and grammar.

We are glad that Dr. Sastri is continuing his edition of the Porulatikāram of the Tolkāppiyam in the Journal of Oriental Research.

V. R.

Toni-vilakku (Tamil Translation of the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana). By Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri.

(P. S. Ganesa Sastri, 38, Pandyan Lane, Andar Street, Teppakulam, Trichy). Rs. 3.

To the poor literature of poetics in Tamil, Dr. P. S. S. Sastri has added this translation of his of the most important classic of literary criticism in Sanskrit, the Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana, expounding the principle of suggestion as the centre of poetic appeal. The difficulty of the task of translating such a text is all the greater because of the corruptions in the text, but in this respect, the translator has had the benefit of the corrections of the text made by the late Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar. Besides students of Tamil, Sanskrit students studying the original Dhvanyāloka may also find this book useful.

V. R.

Digvijayamahākāvya by Meghavijayagani. Edited by Pandit Ambalal Premchandra Saha. Singhi Jain Series. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. Rs 5-12-0.

This is a poem in thirteen cantos describing the life and religious activities of two Jain monks, sixtieth and sixtyfirst, of the Tapāgccha, Vijayadevasūri and Vijayaprabhasūri, of the 17th cent. by Meghavijayagaṇi, pupil of Kṛpāvijayagaṇi of the same Gaccha and century. Of the two Teachers eulogised here, the former was the more celebrated, he having been dealt with in other separate kāvyas by the present author himself as well as by others. Vijayadeva was honoured by Jehangir, and his religious itinerary extended up to Golconda and Bijapur.

The author is a prolific writer who wrote besides ten Kāvyas, works on Jain dialectics, religion, philosophy, astrology, palmistry, and grammar. Four poems of his are in the form of Samasyāpūrtis of lines taken from Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Māgha and Śrīharṣa. One other poem executes by Śleṣa seven themes at one stroke (saptasandhāna). In the present poem too, the author shows his skill in Śleṣa, Yamaka etc., but exhibits some metrical lapses. The poem as a whole is mainly of historical value.

The editor has done his work well. He has furnished the publication with an Introduction on the author and his works, two glosses on the text, one found in the ms. itself and another his own, and an appendix carrying a short prose account of the life of the same monks as are eulogised in the main poem.

V.R.

The Cidgaganacandrikā of Kālidāsa, edited with a new commentary called Divyacakorikā by Sri Pandit Karra Agnihotri Sastri c/o The Gautami Vidya Pitha, Rajahmundry. Rs. 4-8-0.

The Cidgaganacandrikā is an important work for the Śāktas who prize it as a work of the great poet Kālidāsa. It was published from Calcutta in the Āgamānusandhāna Samiti series. Sri Pandit Karra Agnihotri Sastri, an erudite Śākta scholar of Āndhradeśa, has come forward with a revised edition of the text, supplying the verses known through citations, correcting some of the readings, and adding his own gloss. Owing to the great difficulty of printing, he has brought out only a part of the work; it is hoped that the Gautamī Vidyā Pīṭha, Rajahmundry, and its enthusiastic and enlightened Founder-Treasurer will publish the whole work soon.

V.R.

The Mahābhāratatātparyaṭīkā, Jñānadīpikā, of Devabodhācārya. Udyogapārvan. Edited by Dr. S. K. De. Bharatiya Vidy Bhavan. Bombay. Rs. 3.

Devabodha is the earliest known commentator of the Mahābhārata, and as such his work has rightly been used for the critical edition of the Mahābhārata of the BORI, Poona. Unfortunately Devabodha's commentary is available only in a single plamleaf in the RAS., Bengal ; and this ms too is fagmentary. Devabodha follows the northwestern Śaradā K. version of the Epic.

Dr. S.K. De, of the Dacca University, who has edited the Udyoga Parvan for the BORI, has offered us here an edition of the Jñānadīpikā of Devabodha for the Udyoga Parvan. The commentary on the Ādi Parvan has been edited by Dr. R.N. Dandekar in the Annals of the BORI, Poona. The text as offered in the only available ms. shows gaps which the Editor has reconstructed on the basis of the text of later commentators who are definitely known to have followed and borrowed from Devabodha.

If may be pointed out that from his comments on the well known Mahābhārata verse "Suvarṇapuṣpām pṛthivīm" on p. 17 here, Devabodha appears to have written after the time Ānandavardhana and his Dhvanyāloka.

V.R.

Nibandhasangraha. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. Rs. 5-0-0. Bharatiya Vidya Miscellany. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. Rs. 4-0-0.

These two volumes of papers are in honour of the merchant-prince Babu Shri Bahadur Singhji whose munificent patronage of the cause of research has been responsible for many important literary endevours like the Singhi Jaina Grantha Mālā. As a recognition of his help to the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, the Bhavan's Library, its Hall and the Jain Department will be named after him. Sixteen contributions from various scholars enrich the English volume and twenty-eight, the Gujarathi and Hindi Volume. The latter comprises accounts of the life and achievements of the Singhi family which should be the object of emulation by the rich of the country. This volume contains also reproductions of some paintings from Jain ms.-decorations.

V.R.

AN INDO-BRITISH GOODWILL AND CULTURAL MISSION TO INDIA

Mr. Vyvyen Jenkins (Secretary) has sent us the following communication:—

The Mission is being organised on the initiative of the Indian Cultural Unity Movement, in co-operation with the Vedanta Society, the Society for Cultural Fellowship with India, the League for the Federation of Mankind, and the International Animal Service.

The objects of the Mission are:

(1) To interchange ideas and views with distinguished Indians in order to facilitate friendly contact with India at a time when she is regaining her cultural and political freedom, and to present to the Indian public the ideals and principles upheld by the Organisations forming the Mission.

(2) To gain first-hand experience of the great cultures extant in India, and to study their mutual relations and their contributions towards the evolution of a cultural federation of mankind.

(3) To strengthen the relationship of cultural give and take between Indians in Britain and Indians in India.

(4) To help establish a cultural understanding between India and Britain through close association with the spirtual, cultural, social and political groups and societies in India.

The Mission is going to India with a sincere feeling of comradeship and respect for the Indian people, and it is shouldering a heavy financial responsibility for the sake of an ideal. It is hoped that the members of the mission, after their return from India, will arrange an all-Britain tour in order to share their Indian experiences with the people of this country and to create thereby a cultural bridge between India and Britain.

The Mission will be led by Swami Avyaktananda (Founder of the Vedanta Movement in Britain, and President of the Indian Cultural Unity Movement) and will consist of Vyvyen Jenkins (President, the Society for Cultural Fellowship with India), Dr. D. N. Dutt (member, the Indian Cultural Unity Movement),Robert Horniman (member, the Vedanta Society), Margaret Flint (Assistant Secretary, the League for the Feder-

ation of Mankind), Rev. W. M. Andrew (member, the League for the Federation of Mankind), and M. Van Sprang (President, the International Animal Service).

The Mission hopes to arrive in India by September, 1947, and to stay for about six months, visiting all important cities, some towns and a number of villages, so as to come in touch with all sections of the people. In order to feel at one with the ordinary people, the members will follow a simple mode of living in all possible ways.

The members of the Mission will be pleased to accept the hospitality of friendly people in order to come into intimate association with Indian family life. They will value the assistance and co-operation of like-minded people in achieving the objects of the Mission, through fellowship dinners based on vegetarianism (acceptable to all communities), informal tea parties, interviews with people of note, public meetings, conferences and visits to temples, mosques, churches, centres of spiritual significance and places of historical and cultural importance. They will highly appreciate the initiative of individuals and societies in organising, on behalf of the Mission, any of the above-mentioned activities.

It will be a great help to the organisers of the Mission, if Indians residing in Britain and English friends having connections in India will put them in touch with people likely to be interested in the cause. The Mission is earnestly seeking the moral support of cultural India and the help of the Indian people in every concrete way.

Those who are in sympathy with the Msssion and willing to help financially or otherwise are requested to communicate with Vyvyen Jenkins and Radha Rani Borkar, Joint Secretaries, the Indo-British Goodwill and Cultural Mission to India, 51 Lancaster Gate, London, W.2.

OBITUARY

Pandit Sri *T. R. Seshadri Sarma* passed away on 1-5-47. After serving in the Adyar Library for long, he willingly undertook to catalogue the Library of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute for a nominal honorarium and did his work in a thorough manner. The late Pandit was always renowned for his neat Library work and print-like handwriting.

In the passing away on 6th April '47 of Sri *T. R. V. Sarma* Retd. Accountant General, the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute lost one of its valued Fellows. Sri T. R. V. Sarma took great interest in Sāma Veda, to which he belonged, and at the time of his sad demise, he was engaged in editing a Lakṣaṇa grantha of the veda, which he intended to offer to the K. S. R. Institute.

We are sorry to note that the well known Buddhist Scholar, Sri *Dharmanand Kosambi*, passed away at Sewagram on 4-6-47.

At Bangalore, Sri *D. Venkataramayya*, Retd. member of the Mysore Educational Service, passed away. He had published a Translation of the Sastradīpikā (Tarkapada) in the Gaekwad Oriental Series. His Translation of the Pañcapādikā of Padmapāda for the same series is now in press.

We regret to record the death on 4-6-47 of Sri *T. K. Balasubrahmanya Ayyar*, Founder and Proprietor of the well known Vani Vilas Press and Publications, the Sankara Gurukula and its Sanskrit Journal, the Tamil Monthly 'Vani Vilāsinī' and the English Periodical 'Hindu Message' through all of which he rendered signal service to the cause of Hindu culture and the publication of Sanskrit works, especially many rare works produced in South India. Special mention must be made of the Memorial edition of the Complete Works of Śaṅkarācārya brought out by him.

On 9-7-47, passed away Sri Pandit *K. G. Natesa Sastrigal*, Professor, Venkataramana Ayurvedic College. He was proficient in Āyurveda and Jyotiṣa and was keenly interested in research.

On 18-7-47, Mr. *Shaffat Ahmed Khan* passed away in Simla. Before he rose to prominence in Politics and public life.

Shaffat Ahmed Khan was Professor of History and was intimately connected with the Journal of Indian History and the Indian History Congress.

It is with great sorrow that we record here the passing away on 16-7-47 of Sri *B. Sitarama Rao*, a distinguished Advocate of the Madras Bar, and a gentleman of high cultural attainments. He was for a long time the Chairman of the Board of Studies in Kannada in the Madras University. He took great interest in the Samskrita Academy, the Journal of Oriental Research, and the K. S. R. Institute of which last he was a Fellow.

OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS

1. **Vibhrama-Viveka** of Maṇḍana Miśra—edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.) and Vedāntālaṅkāra Prof. T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar, Sanskrit College, Mylapore, Madras .. 0 12 0
2. **Vīṇāvāsavadattā** (an old Sanskrit drama), edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.) and Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon.), Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras .. 0 8 0
3. **Tolkāppiyam** with an English translation, by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., L.T., Ph.D., Principal, Raja's College, Tiruvadi (Vol. I) .. 1 0 0
4. **Tolkāppiyam** Do. Do. Vol. II, Part 1 .. 2 0 0
5. **History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil,** by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., L.T., Ph.D., Principal, Raja's College, Tiruvadi .. 6 0 0
6. **Dhvanyāloka & Locana** of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta with Kaumudī by Uttuṅgodaya and Upalocana edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.), Sri T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar and Dr. T. R. Chintamani, M.A., Uddyota I .. 8 0 0
7. The Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume .. 3 0 0
8. Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit by Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri .. 2 0 0
9. Compromises in the History of Vedanta by Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri .. 1 4 0

Copies can be had of: **The Secretaries,**

The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute,

Mylapore, MADRAS.

INDEX

A

Abhidhānacintāmaṇi, 133.
Ācāra adhyāya, Pt. III. i.
Accent in Sanskrit, on the nature and designation of the, 28.
Accent, theory of, 28-33.
Aditikauśikastriyaḥ, 110, 111, 112.
Aditistriyaḥ, 110.
Aḍiyārkkunallār, 115.
Advaitānanda, 2.
Aesculapius, 80.
Agni, 48, 52, 54, 57, 61.
Agniveśa, 81.
Āgrāyaṇa, 20.
Ahaṅkāra, 173, 180.
Ahaval metre, 147, 148
Ahiṁsā and Asaṅga, Pt. III. i.
Āhituṇḍikā, 112, 113.
Āhnikacandrikā, 34.
Ahobalasūri, 37.
Airāṇikkuḷam, 15.
Aitareyabrāhmaṇa, 62.
Akbar, 151, 157.
Ākṣipta, the word, 32.
Alagappa Chettiar, 138, 139, 142.
Alladi Krishnaswami Ayyar, 138, 139.
Altindische Grammatik, 32.
Ālūr plates, 120, 122.
Amalānanda, 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8.
Amaramālā, 133.
Amarasiṁha, 6.
Ambaṇavas, 114.
Ānandajñāna, 3.
Andrew, Rev. W. M., 199.
Anantanarayana Sastri, P.S., 161.
Andhra History, a Forgotten Chapter of, Pt. II. Book Review.
Aney, M.S., 138.
Aṅgirasas, 52.
Angkor Park, 166.
Angkor Thom, 169.
Angkor Vat, modern inscriptions in, 167.
Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Silver Jubilee Number, 1.
Annam, 164, 165.
Annam, cult of immortals in, 168.
Antomarchi, M., 167.
Anubhūtisvarūpa, 1.
Anudātta, 28, 29.
Anukramaṇī, 18.
Anumānalakṣaṇam, Pt. II. Supplement, 9-16.
Anunyāsa, author of the, 25-27, 78.
Apajarguranṭaḥ, 49.
Appar svāmigal, 185.
Appayya Dīkṣita, 1.
Appuswami, P.N., 159.
Apramāda, 136, 137.
Apūrva, 7, 8, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46.
Arabian horses, 132-33.
Aravamuda Ayyangar, S., 138.
Arthaśāstra, 110-13.
Ārya, King, 16.
Assyrians, 80.
Aśvacikitsita of Nakula, 127-34.
Aśvavaidyaka, 133.
Aśvinau, 18.
Aśvins, 18, 19, 20, 79, 80-81.
Atharva-veda, 20, 30.
Ātman-psychology, 173-82.
Ātreya, 79, 81.
Aufrecht, 25, 27,
Aurangazeb, 150, 151, 157.
Aurṇanābha, 20.
Avavṛtranta, 56.
Avidyā, 3, 4, 8.
Avyaktānanda, Svāmi, 198.
Āyu, 54.
Āyurveda, history of, 78-82.
Ayyan (Ārya), 16.

B

B. C. Law Volume, 158.
Baba Lal, 152, 154.
Babylonians, 80.
Bachhofer, L., 21.
Bahnar's customer, 168.
Balasubrahmanya Ayyar, D., 161.
Balasurahmanya Ayyar, K., Pt. I. ii, iii, iv; Pt. II. ii; Pt. III. ii; 135, 139, 143, 182, 189.
Balasubrahmanya Ayyar, T. K., 200.
Bāṇa, 133.
Baradat, M., 1?7.
-Bassac archaeology, Trans., 172.
Bassac Delta, 169, 172.
Bayon's towers at Angkor Thom, 164.
Beḍāvṛtti, 66.
Belvalkar, S.K., 25, 26, 138.
Bernier, 152.
Besnagar, 137.
Besnagar sculpture, 21.
Bhagavadgītā, 135.
Bhagavadgītā, Tamil translation, 159.
Bhagavadgītā-laghukośa, 192.
Bhaktāmaracarita, 74.
Bhāmatī school of vedānta, 1.
Bhāradvāja, 79.
Bhāratīya Vidyā Miscellany, 197.
Bhratari, 67, 68.
Bhāratī, 149.
Bhartāri, 67.
Bhartarīśvara, 65.
Bhartṛdāman, 65.
Bhartṛhara, 64.
Bhartṛhari, 64-77.
Bhartṛhari, the grammarian, 64, 65-67.
Bhartṛhari, legends on, 73-74.
-Bhartṛhari, Nātha-, 67-69.
Bhartṛhari, the king, 64 67, 68.
Bhartṛhari, the name, 64-65.
Bhartṛhari, the poet, 71-73.
Bhartṛharinirveda, 68.
-Bhartṛharis, the two pseudo-, 64, 69-71.
Bhartṛhema, 64.
Bhartri, 68.
Bhartṛlaharī, 64.
Bhartṛmeṇṭha, 65.
Bhartṛprapañca, 65.
Bhartṛsārasvata, 65.
Bhartṛsvāmin, 65.
Bhartṛyajña, 65.
25.
Bhatṛhara, 64.
Bhatṛhari. 64.
65, 66.
Bhela, 81.
Bhīṣmācārya, 71.
Bhoja, 82, 127-32.
Bhoja's Sṛṅgāraprakāśa, 187-89.
Bezzenberger, 30, 32.
Bloomfield, Maurice, 30, 31.
Borkar, Radha Rani, 199.
Brahmā, 79.
Brahmā realisation, 7, 8.
Brahman, 2, 4.
Brahmasūtras: See Vedāntasūtras.
Brahmavidyābharaṇa, 2.
Brahmopadeśa, 2.
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, 5, 6, 135.
Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, the psychology of the, 173-82.
Bṛhaddevatānukramaṇī, 18.
Bṛhatkathā, 147.
Brugmann, 31.
Buddha, images of, 164, 166.
Buddhist Institute of Cambodia, 167, 168.
Buddhist pantheons in Tonquines pagodas, 168.
Buddhists in South India, 147.

C

Cakorasandeśa, 14-16.
Cambodia, 164, 165, 166.
Cambodia, History of, 167.
-Cambodian, Pali-, dictionary, 168.
Cambodian dictionary, 168.
Cambodian inscriptions, corpus of, 167.
Cambodian studies, 166.
Candragomin 65, 73.
Candralekhā saṭṭaka, 190.

Caraka, 81.
Cārucaryā, 82.
Catalogue of Dutch Manuscript maps, 165.
Centaurs, 80.
Chaldeans, 80.
Chalukya history, 119-20.
Champa's antecendents, 167.
Chandar Bahu, 152.
Chandrasekharan, T., Pt. I. iii.
Chintamani, T.R., Pt. I. iii.; 1, 78.
Chung ethnical groups, 167.
Churning of the ocean, 80.
Cidgaganacandrikā, 196.
Cintāmaṇi, 144.
Cochin-China, 163.
Cochin - China, archaeological researches in, 16⁵, 169-72.
Coedes 166, 167, 171.
Colani, Madeleine, 163, 164, 165, 167.
Constantine, the Africanus, 82.
Coomaraswamy, Ananda K., 189.
Cos = Kāśi, 81.

D

Dādaism, 32, 33.
Dama, 135, 136, 137.
Dāna, 135.
Dānacandrikā, 34.
Dānasaṅkṣepacandrikā, 34.
Dara Shikoh, Pt. II. ii; 150-57.
Das Gupta, Charu Chandra, 21.
Dasrāu, semantic history of the word, 18-20.
Dayā, 135.
Dead language, 184.
Deccan, Historical sketches of the ancient, 145.
Destombes, M. Marcel, 164, 165.
Devabodhācārya, 196
Dhammapada Atthakathā, 168.
Dhanasāra version of *Śatakatrayī*, 74.
Dhanvantari, 79.
Dharma, 37-43.
Dhruva, the Rashtrakuta king, 9-12.
Dhūrtākhyāna, 192.
Dhvanyāloka, Tamil translation of, 194.
Dhyāna, 7.
Didarganj sculpture, 21, 22, 23, 24.
Digvijayamahākāvya, 195.
Dikshit, K. N., 159-60.
Diṅnāga, 146.
Discovery of India, 183.
Divākara, 34.
Divākara, Siddhasena, 192.
Dodwell, H. H., 160.
Dṛḍhā vadan, 50, 51.
Dṛṣṭaphala, 8.
Dubreuil, G Jonvean, Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Dupont, M., 166, 167.
Durga, 58.
Durghaṭavṛtti, 25, 27, 78.
Durvinīta, 147.
Dutt, D. N., 198.
Dvarati art, 166.
Dyā Dviveda, 31.

E

Early History of Linguistic Science in India, 31.
Early Indian Sculpture, 21.
East and West, 189, 190.
Ecole Francaise d'Extreme Orient, activities during 1940-45, 163-68.
Egyptian medicine, 79.
Elliptic duals, 19.
Enclytic particles, 31.
Erasistras, 81.
Evans, I. H. N., 170.
Evolution af Hindu Moral Idcals, Pt. III. i.

F

Faddegon, 32, 33.
Far Eastern Hinduised States, ancient history of, 167.
Finot, Louis, 167.
Flint, Margaret, 198.
Foreword, Pt. I. i-ii.
Formichi, Carlo, Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Founan's sites, the discovery of, 169-72.
Foundation Day Address, 139-42

Foundation Day, Second, K.S.R. I., 138-43.
Free will, 3.
Funeral ritual, Annamite Buddhist, 168.

G

Gajabāhu I, 144, 146.
Ganapati Sastri, T., 110, 111, 112.
Ganga grants, 120
Gaṅgavāḍi province, 10.
Geldner, 50, 52, 54, 55, 56, 59.
Geography, Ptolomy's, studies on, 164-65.
German, 30
Giap, Than van, 168.
Gītā, 47; See also *Bhagavdgītā*.
Giulleminet, P., 168.
Glaize, M., 166.
Goda Śaṅkara, rājas of Punnattūr, 16.
Gode, P. K., 34, 127.
Goloubew, Victor, 163, 166.
Gomataḥ, 49.
Gopālikā, 13, 14, 17.
Gorakhnāth and *the Kānphāṭā Yogis*, 67.
Gorakṣa Kiniyāgāra, 67, 68.
Gorresio, 116.
Gothic, 30.
Govinda III, the Rashtrakuta king, 9-12.
Govindarāja, 116.
Govindarāja Rashtrakuta, 120, 121-23.
Grassman, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 59.
Greek medicine, 80, 81.
Grosluer, Georges, 163.
Grundris, 31.
Guṇāḍhya, 147.
Guruvāyūr, 16.

H

Hāī, 33.
Hanoi, 163.
Hanoi, museum of, 164.
Harappa sculpture, 22,
Hari, 64, 65.
Haribhadrasūri, 192.
Haricaritakāvya, 13.
Harikavi, 65.
Harivṛṣabha, 65.
Harṣacarita, 133.
Hasanat-ul-Arifin, 152.
Haug, 28.
Hayavadana Rao, C., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Hedonism, 46.
Helārāja, 65, 67.
Heliodorus column at Besnagar, 135-37.
Helmholtz, 29.
Hemacandra, 133.
Hick, 30.
Hinduism and Islam, 155, 157.
Hinduism outside India, 193.
Hippocrates, 80-81.
Hitas, the nerves, 182.
Hiranand Sastri, 160.
Hiraṇyavarman, 118.
Hiriyanna, M., 1, 37.
Hist., Ind. Indonesian Art, 21.
Horniman, Robert, 198.
Horses, science of, 127-34.
Hultzsch, 145.
Huyen, Ngyen van, 168.

I

Iḷaṅgovaḍigaḷ, 114, 144, 146, 147, 148.
Imhotep, 79.
Indian Cultural Unity Movement, 198.
Indian Culture and English Influence, 189-90.
Indian culture and philosophy, Pt. II. i.
Indian Culture Essay Competition, 162.
Indian Culture, Prākṛt Languages and their contribution to, 189.
Indian sculpture, 21, 22.
Indian society, the religious basis of the forms of, 189-90.

Indo-British Goodwill and Cultural Mission to India, 198-99.
Indo-China, archæology in, 165, 169-72.
Indo-China, epigraphy in, 166
Indo-China, ethnology, folklore and religions in, 167.
Indo-China, history of, 167.
Indo-China, Indian colonisations of, 171.
Indo-China, linguistic publications about, 168.
Indo-China, museums in, 164.
Indo-China, preservation of historical monuments of, 164.
Indo-China, research in, 163-68, 169-72.
Indo-China, research publications on, 164.
Indo-Chinese Institute for the study of Man, 165.
Indra 2, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 79.
Indu, the author of Anunyāsa. 26-28, 78.
Indus valley sculpture, 21, 22, 23, 24.
International Animal Service, 198.
Īśā upaniṣad, 37.
Islam and Hinduism, 155, 157.
Iṣṭasiddhi, 1.
Īśvara, 3, 4.
It-sing's account of Bhartṛhari, 65, 66, 67.

J

Jains in South India, 147.
Janaka, 5.
Janaka-Yājñavalkya dialogue, 176.
Janmāmbodhi, 66.
Jātakas, fifty, 168.
Jātavedas, 57.
Jayadatta 133.
Jayamaṅgala, 112, 113.
Jayavarman VII, 166.
Jenkins, Vyvyen, 198, 199.
Jessia, 152.
Jigartim, 48.
Jinendra, 25,
Jīva, 2, 4, 8.
Jñāpakasamuccaya, 25.
Johnston, E. H., Pt. II, Obituary Notices.
Journal of Oriental Research, history of, Pt. I. i, iii-iv ; Pt. II. i; Pt. III, i.
Jyotiṣṭoma 38, 39, 41, 42, 44.

K

Kabir, Pt. II. ii.
Kaiśikācārya, 116.
Kaiyaṭa, 25.
Kālaka, Jain ācārya, 69.
Kālanirṇayacandrikā, 34.
Kālidāsa, 196.
Kalki era, 69.
Kalpataru 1, 4.
Kamalākara, 34.
Kambarāmāyaṇam, lectures on, 159.
Kambha, 9-12.
Kāmya karma, 38, 40.
Kanagasabai Pillai, V., 144.
Kane, P.V., 34.
Kaṇṇaki, 148.
Kānphāṭā yogis, 64, 69.
Kapadvanj grant of Kṛṣṇa II, 12.
Karka Suvarṇanāsa, Surat plates of, 10-11.
Karma, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46.
Karpeles, Mlle. S., 163, 169.
Kuruntokai, commentary on, 159.
Kāśikā, commentary on, 13.
Kāśikāvivaraṇapañcikā, 25.
Kataka, 116.
Kaṭha upaniṣad, 37.
Katre, S. M., 138.
Kauśika in the Arthaśāstra, 110-13.
Kāuśika, in the Mālavikāgnimitra, 113-14.
Kauśika, in the Rāmāyaṇa, 115-16.
Kauśika in the Śilappadikāram, 114-15.
Kauśika, on a meaning of the word, 110-16.
Kauśikastriyaḥ, 110-16.

Kauṣītaka upaniṣad, 2.
Keith, A. B., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Kauṭilya, 110.
Kavīndrācārya, 152.
Keynote, the concept of, in the Taittirīya Prātiśākhya, 28-33.
Khmer art & civilisation, 163, 166.
Khmer inscriptions, 167.
Khudairajya, Pt. II. ii.
Khurasan horses, 132-33.
Kīlkaṇakku works, 147.
Kokilasandeśam, 17.
Kokilesvar Sastri, Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Kosambi, D.D., 64.
Kosambi, Dharmanand, 200.
Kottayam, 17.
Kovalan, 144, 148.
Kramrisch, 21, 22.
Krishnaswami Ayyangar, S., 160.
Krishnaswami Ayyar, Alladi, 138, 139.
Krishnaswami Ayyar, V., Pt. III. i, 140.
Kṣemendra, 82.
Kūlavāṇikan Śāttanār, 144, 147.
Kumaraswami, P., 144.
Kumārila, 40, 65.
Kuṇḍalakeśi, 144.
Kuppuswami Sastri, S., Pt. I. i, iii, iv ; 32, 139-43, 146, 159 ; Pt. II. i.
Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Pt. I. i, ii, iv ; 138-43 ; Pt. II. i ; Pt. III. i.
Kurān 151, 153, 156.
Kuśacchandasstutyupagānavat, 6.
-Kuy, Franco-,vocabulary, 165.

L

Laos, 164, 168.
Larkana, 23, 24.
Lastian magic, 168.
Latin, 30.
League for the Federation of Mankind, 198.
Levy, M. Paul, 164, 165, 168.
Liṅ, 43, 44, 46.
Loka-veda-nyāya, 43.
Lokeśvara, statue of, 164.
Lüders, Heinrich, Dr. and Mrs., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Ludwig, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 59.

M

Macdonnel, 57, 59.
Mackay, Dr., 23.
Mādhava, commentator on Vṛtta-vṛtta, 69.
Madhava Krishna Sarma, K., 25.
Mādhavācārya, 25.
Mādhavayajvan, 111, 112.
Mādhavīyadhātuvṛtti, 26.
Madras Law Journal, Pt. III. i.
Madras Sanskrit Academy, Pt. II. i, ii.
Madura, 146, 148.
Madura Tamil Saṅgam, 159.
Mahābhārata, 56. 62, 69, 136, 137.
Mahābhārata-tātparyapaṭīkā - (Jñānadīpikā), 196.
Mahānubhāva, 71.
Mahatma Gandhi, Pt. II. ii.
Mahāvaṁśa, 144.
Maheśvara, 58, 60.
Maitreyarakṣita, 25, 26, 27, 7..
Majma-ul-Bahrain, 142, 150, 154-57.
Malabar, 17.
Mālavikāgnimitra, 113, 114.
Malavya, Madan Mohan, 160.
Malleret, Louis, 164, 169, 170, 172.
Mālū Narahari, 67.
Manana, 6. 7.
Manas, 179.
Mānasollāsa, 133.
Maṇḍanamiśra, 13.
Māṇḍūkya upaniṣad, 175.
Maṇimekhalai, 144, 146, 148.
Manne plates, 9, 10, 11, 12, 120, 122.
Marriage songs in Indo-China, 168.
Marshall, Sir John, 23.
Maruts, 57, 162.
Mātṛgupta, 65.

Maurya age, stone sculpture of, 21, 22.
Māyā, 3, 4.
Mayūrasandeśa, 17.
Max Muller, 65.
Medicine in India, history of, 78-82.
Meghadūta, commentary on, 13.
Meghavijayagaṇi, 195.
Mekong delta, 169, 172.
Meṇtha, 65.
Merutuṅga, 71, 72, 73.
Mimāṁsāsūtras, commentary on, 13
Mitākṣarā, Pt. III, i.
Mlu-Prei-Cambodia, 165.
Mohamedans in Indo-China, 168.
Mohenjo-daro and the Indus civilisation, 23.
Mohenjo-daro sculpture, 22, 23, 24.
Mois, 168.
Mokṣa, 8.
Monks and pilgrims in Asia, 166.
Mudrārākṣasa, 113.
Mukālma-i-Dārā Shikūh wa Bābā Lāl, 152.
Mūkkola temple (Muktisthala), 16.
Muktisthala (Mukkola), 16.
Mulla Shah, 151.

N

Nāgārjuna, 81.
Nageśa, 25.
Naimittika-karma 39.
Nakula, *Aśvacikitsita* of, 127-34.
Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, 117-26.
Narasiṁha Dīkṣita, 34, 35.
Narasimhavarman II, 117-18.
Narayana Aiyar, R., 83.
Nārāyana-aṣṭākṣaramantra, 152.
Narayanaswami Iyer, R., Pt. I. ii.
Nāsatyāu, semantic history of the word, 18-20.
Natesa Sastrigal, K.G., 200.
Nātha Bhartṛhari, 67-69, 75.
Nātha sect, 67, 68, 69.
Nāthapanthīyas, 68, 69.
Navanātha-Bhaktisāra, 67.
Nāyattoṭṭam, 15.
Nehru, Jewaharlal, 183, 184.
Ner, 167.
Nibandhasaṅgraha, 197.
Nikumbhavadha, Pt. II. ii.
Nilakanta Sastri, K. A., 9, 145, 167.
Nirguṇabrahman, 2.
Nirukta, 19, 58.
Nītimañjarī, 31.
Nītitattvāvirbhāva, commentary on, 13.
Nitya-dharma, 39, 40.
Niyoga, the doctrine of, 37-47.
Niyojya, 41, 42, 45.
Nyāsa, 25.
Nyāyakaṇikā, commentary on, 13.
Nyāyapraveśa, 146.

O

Obituary Notices, 84, 158-61; 200-01.
OC-EO excavations, 164, 170, 171, 172.
Oldenberg, 53, 61.
Oṁ, 30-32.
Osthoff, 30.
Ourselves, Pt. I., iii-iv.
Outlines of Indian Philosophy, 46.

P

Padapāṭha, 30, 31.
Pālayūr, 16.
Pali-Cambodian dictionary, 168.
Pallava art, 166.
Pallava history, 117-26.
Pañcatantra, 63.
Pāṇini, 29, 30.
Panniyūr village, brahmins of the, 17.
Pant Saheb Pratinidhi, 138.
Parameśvaras of Payyūr, 13-17.
Parameśvaravarman II, 118, 119.
Parāśara-Mādhavīya, Pt. III, i.
Parasparabhāvanā, 1̣20.
Paribhāṣāvṛtti, 25, 26, 78.
Paribhāṣenduśekhara, 25.

Pārikāthai, 159.
Parimala, 7.
Paris, (Mr.), 166.
Parkham sculpture, 21, 22.
Parmentier, Henri, 169.
Pātakatyāga-vidhi, 34.
Patna sculptures, 21, 22.
Paṭṭaḍakal inscription, 120.
Pattinippāṭṭu, 149.
Payyūr Bhaṭṭas. 13-17.
Persian horses in Sanskrit literature, 133.
Peruṅgadai, 117.
Petrus Plancius map of the world, 165.
Phūt + kṛ, 63.
Pischel, 54.
Pluti, 30.
Porkalam, 14.
Prabandhacintāmaṇi, 71.
Prabhākara, 41.
Prabhākara school of Mīmāṁsā, 40, 42, 44, 45.
Pracaya, 28, 29, 30.
Pragṛhya, 31.
Prakaraṇapañcikā of Śālikanātha, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44.
Prakaṭārtha, gleanings from, 1-8.
Prakaṭārtha-vivaraṇa 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 6, 7, 8.
Prākṛt Languages and their Contribution to Indian Culture, 191.
Prāṇa, 181.
Prāṇa. the individual soul, 2.
Praśardha, 53.
Pratardana, king, 2.
Pratibruvīmahi 49.
Prāyaścittacandrikā, of Divākara 34.
Prāyaścittacandrikā of Viśvanātha bhaṭṭa, date of, 34-36.
Prāyaścittoddhāra of Divākara, 34.
Pruth, the root, 52.
Ptolomy's geography, studies on, 164-65.
Punarupanayanaprayoga, 34.
Punnattūr, rājas of, 16.
Pūrṇasarasvatī, 64.
Puruṣa, 179, 182.
Puruṣottamadeva, 26.

Q

Qadiriya order, 151.

R

Rādhānpūr plates, 9, 10, 11, 12.
Raghava Iyengar, R., 158-59.
Raghavan, V., 1, 78, 110, 142, 150, 158, 187, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197.
Rāhaṭakāvya of Bhartṛhari, 74.
Raja, C. Kunhan, 13.
Raju, P. T., 173.
Rajwade, V. K., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Rakṣita, 27, 78.
Rakṣita, surname, 27.
Ramdhun, Pt. II. ii.
Rama Pisharoti, Panditaraja, K., 160.
Ramachandrachar, Kapay, 160.
Rāmakṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, 34.
Rāmānanda, 3.
Rāmānuja, 37.
Rāmarājya, Pt. II. ii.
Rāmāyaṇa, Pt. II. i, ii; 115, 116.
Rāmāyaṇa, Studies in the, 193.
Rāmāyaṇa, lectures of V. S. Srinivasa Sastri on. Pt. II. i.
Raṇakhala, 14.
Rāvaṇavadha, 65.
Reddy, D. V. S., 79.
Regimen Sanitas, 82.
Religious Basis of the Forms of Indian Society, 189.
Ṛg-veda, 19, 20, 30, 31.
Ṛg-veda-Prātiśākhya, 31.
Rhade of Darlac, 167.
Rhys Davids Mrs., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Risala-i-Ilak Nama, 151, 153.
Roth, 48, 49, 55, 56.
Ṛṣis of Payyūr, 13-17.
Rudra, 79.
Rudradāsa, 190.

S

Sabalie, Albert, 167.
Śabara, 38, 44.

Safinat-ul-Awliya, 151, 152.
Saguṇa-brahman, 2, 8.
Saigon, 163.
Saigon museum, 164.
Śākalya, 31.
Śālikanātha 37.
Sam (adverb), 57.
Sāma-veda, 32.
Saṁhitā, 29.
Sampāti-vacana, 83.
Sampratipatti, 150.
Samudra-saṅgama-grantha, 150-57.
Saṁvāda, 150.
Sanatsujātīya, 136, 137.
Sangam age, 146.
Saṅghatilakācārya, 192.
Saṅkara, king, 16.
Śaṅkarācārya, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 32.
Sanskrit, the Vitality and Persistance of, 183-86.
Santanam Ayyar, N., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Śāntipaddhati, 71.
Śāntiśataka of Śilhaṇa, 71.
Sannyāsin, 7.
Sāptam, 55.
Śaraṇadeva, 78.
Sarma, T. R. V., 200.
Sarmad, 151.
Sarvamukti, 8.
Sarvarakṣita, 27.
Sastri, P. P. S., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Śatakatrayī, On the Authorship of the, 64-77.
Śatakatrayī—Text criticism, 74-77.
Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa, 5.
Śāttanār, 144, 148.
Sāyaṇa, 18, 20, 32, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 58.
Schayer, Stanislaw, Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Schrader, Otto, 185.
Scidenpaden, Major, 167.
Sculpture, 21, 22, 23, 24.
Semantic change, 18.
Śeṅkoṭṭiyāḷ, 114.
Śeṅkuṭṭuvan, 146, 148.
Sensations of the Tone, the, 29.
Śen Tamil, 159.
Seshadri Sarma, T. R., 200.
Shaffat Ahmad Khan, 200.
Shama Sastri, R., Pt. II. Obituary Notices, 110, 112.
Shanmukha Mudaliyar, A., 138.
Sheet-anchor of Tamil literature, 144.
Siddhāntaleśasaṅgraha, 1, 4, 7, 8.
Siddhasena Divākara, 192.
Śilappadikāram, date of, 114, 142, 144-49.
Śilhaṇa, 71.
Sīradeva, 25, 26, 78, 215, 216.
Sirr-i-Akbar, 153.
Sītā, the quest of, 83-109.
Sitaram Jayaram Joshi, 31.
Sitarama Rao, B., 201.
Sivaswami Ayyar, P. S., Pt. I. i, iii; Pt. III. i-ii.
Skandasvāmin, 55, 58, 59, 60.
Smārta-niṣkṛtipaddhati of Divākara, 34.
Smārtaprāyaścittoddhāra of Divakara, 33.
Society for Cultural Fellowship with India, 198.
Soma, 50, 52.
Somadeva, 71.
Somaka, 79, 80.
Someśvara, 133.
'Soul's Banner' 168.
Sphoṭasiddhi, commentary on, 13.
Sprang, M. Van, 199.
Śrautaprāyaścittacandrikā 34, 35.
Śravaṇa, 6, 7.
Śrī-Dhī-Grāma (Tiru-Manaś-śeri) 17.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, T.R., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Srinivasa Sastri, V. S. Pt. I. ii; Pt. II. i-ii; 139.
Srischandra Chakravarti, 25.
Śrīvijaya, kingdom of, 167.
Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, 187-89.
Stambha, 11.
Stcherbatsky, Th., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Stein, Aurel, Pt. II. Obituary Notices.

Stein, Otto, Dr. and Mrs., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Stein, R., 167, 168.
Stobha list, 32.
Stone sculpture, 21, 22, 23, 24,
Subramania Iyer, K. V., 145.
Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., 18.
Subrahmanyam, K., 39.
Sufis, 151, 152, 156.
Sumanoramaṇī, 13.
Sundaram Aiyar, P. S., 29.
Sunga age, sculpture of, 21.
Surat plates of Karka Suvarṇanāsa, 10-11, 12.
Sūrya, statuette of, 164.
Śuṣ, the root, 48-63.
Śuṣṇa, 58, 59, 60.
Suśruta Saṁhitā 81-82.
Svaminatha Iyer, V., 144, 145, 147.
Svara, 32-33.
Svara iti stobhaḥ, explanation of, 32-33.
Svāram bhavati, explanation of, 32-33.
Svarga, 38.
Svargakāma, 41, 44.
Svarita, 28, 29, 32.
Śvas, the root, 48-63.
Śvasantam, 49.
Śvetāṭavī, 15.
Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, 25.

T

Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, the concept of keynote in the, 28-33.
Tājika horses, 133.
Takshasila, 81.
Talappilli 16, 17.
Tamil Reader, Historical, 194.
Tamilagam, Āryan imigration into, 146-47.
Tamils, characteristics of, 146-47.
Tamils 1800 *Years Ago*, 144.
Tamils, the ancient, 146-47.
Tamre ethnical groups, 167.
Tanaye, 54.
Tāṇḍya-brāhmaṇa, 32.
Tantrākhyāyikā, 72.
Tantrapradīpa, 25.
Tantrarahasya of Rāmānuja, 37, 46, 47.
Tārānātha, 67, 75.
Tarkasaṅgrahadīpikā, 38.
Tata Subbaraya Sastri, Pt. II. Obituary Notices.
Tattvabindu, commentary on, 13.
Tattvavibhāvanā, commentary on Tattvabindu, 13.
Tehen la, dislocation of the, 167.
Terracota figurine, 21-22.
Tevāram hymns, 185-86.
Thien-Lāu, 165.
Thime, Paul, 31.
Thomas, F. W, 185.
st. Thomas, 16.
Thomson, D'Arcy W., 184.
Thoth, 79.
Tibetan etymology, 168.
Tilaka, 116.
Tiru-manaś-śeri, 17.
Tirunāvāy, 14, 15.
Tiruvelaṅgāḍ, 15, 17.
Tmesis, 18.
Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram, 194.
Tolkāppiyam-Section III-*Porulatikāram*, Pt. IV. Supplement, 1-10.
Toni-vilakku, 194.
Tonmai, 149.
Transbassac archaeology, 172.
Trichur, 14, 17.
Tripitaka, 168.
Trippunithura, 15.
Trivadi Sanskrit College, Pt. III. ii.
Ts'o Fow Yuan Kouei, 117.
Tyāga, 136, 137.

U

Udātta 28, 29, 30, 32,.
Udayanan-Peruṅgadai 147, 149.
Udayendiram plates, 119.
Uddaṇḍa, 17.
Ujjvaladatta, 78.
Uṁbeka, 65.
Upaniṣads, Psychology of the, 173-75.

Ur, 80.
Uragam, 17.
Uttaratantra, 81.

V

Vācaspatimiśra 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8,
Vāgbhaṭa, 82.
Vaikuṇṭha Perumal koil inscription, 118, 119.
Vairāgyaśataka, commentary on, by Mīnanātha, 68.
Pillai, S., 142, 144, 159,
Vākyapadīya 64, 65, 66, 67, 73, 74, 75.
Vākyārtharatna of Ahobalasūri, 37, 41, 42, 43, 47.
Valaya (Uragam), 17.
Valayāpati, 144.
Vālmīki's technique, a critical study of, 83-109.
Vanā, the word, 60-61.
Vanneri country, 16.
Varadacharya, S. T. G., 138.
Vat Prahkeo of Vientiane, 164.
Vedānta Society, 198.
Vedānta-sūtrabhāṣya, 1.
Vedānta-sūtras I. i. 28-31, criticism on, 1-3.
Vedānta-sūtras II. iii. 41-42, criticism on, 3-4.
Vedānta-sūtras III. i. 1-7, criticism on, 4-5.
Vedānta-sūtra III. iii. 26, criticism on, 5-6
Vedānta-sūtra III. iv. 47, criticism on, 6-7.
Vedānta-sūtra III. iv. 51, criticism on, 7-8.
Vedānta-sūtras IV. iv, 17-22, criticism on, 8.
Vedāraṇya, 14.
Vedavādadvātriṁśikā, 192.
Vedic Studies III—The roots śvas, śuṣ, 48, 63.
Velaṅgāḍ, 14.
-Velaṅgāḍ, Tiru-, 15, 17.
Veṅkatarama Sastri, T. R., 139.
Veṅkataramanayya, N., Pt. II. Reviews, 117.
Venkataramayya, D., 200.
Venkatasubbiah, A., 48.
Venkayya, 145.
Vibhramaviveka, 13.
Vidyā, 5.
Vidyullatā, commentary on Meghasandeśa, 64.
Vijñāna, 181, 182.
Vijñānaśataka, 64, 70.
Vikrama era, 69.
Vikramāditya, 67, 69.
Village festivals in Indo-China, 168.
Vinaya commentary, 168.
Viṣṇu, statuette of, 104.
Viṣṇus in Indo-China, 166.
Viśuddhimagga, 168.
Viśvabhūṣaṇa, 74.
Viśvanāthabhaṭṭa, son of Narasiṁha, 34-36.
Viṭavṛtta, 64, 69-70, 71.
Vivaraṇa school of vedānta, 1, 2, 3, 4.
Vṛtra, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57, 59, 61, 62.
Vṛttikāra, 2, 3.
Vṛttipradīpa (*Tantrapradīpa*), 25.
Vyālagrāhī, 110, 112.

W

Wackernagal, 32.
Whitney, 28.
William Jones, 183.

Y

Yājñavalkya, 5.
Yājñavalkya-Janaka dialogue, 176.
Yāḻ, 114.
Yamaka-kāvyas of Payyūr Bhaṭṭas, 13.
Yamapaṭṭikā, 113.
Yaśastilakacampū, 71.
Yāska, 19, 58.
Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja, 127-30.

Z

Zimmer, H., Pt. II. Obituary Notices.

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS, MYLAPORE, MADRAS.